DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 054 416	AC 010 713
AUTHOR	Griffith, William S.; And Others
TITLE	Cooperative Program Improvement; An Experiment in ABE In-Service Training. Doolittle Family Education Center Experimental In-Service Training Project. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Chicago Univ., Ill. Dept. of Education.c
PUB DATE	Oct 71
NOTE	180p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	*Adult Basic Education; *Cooperative Programs; Data Analysis; *Disadvantaged Groups; Experimental Programs; Improvement Programs; *Inservice Education; *Interagency Cooperation; Problem Solving; Projects; Student Participation; Student Teacher Relationship
IDENTIFIERS	Doolittle Family Education Center

ABSTRACT

This document, consisting of seven chapters and 12 appendixes, is a full final report of the Doolittle Family Education Center Experimental In-Service Training Project. Chapter II consists of the history and plan of the project including an explanation of the framework of the model that was used to conceptualize the project. Chapter III is a report of the sequence of events associated with the execution of the project, and Chapter IV sets forth the priority ordering of the problems and solutions identified by the students and professional personnel associated with the Doolittle Center. Chapter V is a report of the perceptions of the project staff from the University of Chicago regarding the operation of the project. Chapter VI is a description of the revised model for an in-service training program for an ABE center, and Chapter VII is a listing of the conclusions reached by the project staff following their analysis of the data presented in the preceding chapters. Twenty tables illustrate the data obtained and discussed in the text. (CK)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED054416

Cooperative Program Improvement:

An Experiment in ABE In-Service Training

University of Chicago
October, 1971

William S. Griffith
Phyllis M. Cunningham
Stephen A. Treffman

AC010713

ED054416

DOOLITTLE FAMILY EDUCATION CENTER
EXPERIMENTAL
IN-SERVICE TRAINING PROJECT

Final Report

William S. Griffith
Phyllis M. Cunningham
Stephen A. Treffman

Adult Education Special Field
Department of Education
The University of Chicago
1970 - 1971

Acknowledgments

The development of the experimental in-service training project could not have taken place without the cooperation and support of many individuals, only some of whom are specifically identified at this point:

The Joint Advisory Committee under the leadership of Raymond Carleton;

David L. Daniel, Herbert Herman, Robert L. Jack and Frank Wilhelm of the Cook County Department of Public Aid;

James F. Redmond, Herbert W. Lehmann, Vernon Miller and Robert Grimes of the Chicago Public Schools;

Jerome Brown, Arthur White and Francine Scott of the WIN program;

Cheryl Jackson, president, and other members of the Doolittle Student Council;

Jerome Bradley, representative of the Office of the Illinois Superintendent of Public Instruction; and

Thomas Brady, Gilles Cloutier, Sonnie Cox, Karin Dahl, Dennis Day, Vera Dexter, Ann Fales, Maureen Fay, Logan Green, Eunice Neal, and Holly Wicker, students at The University of Chicago who assisted with planning, conducting the sessions, collecting the data, and monitoring the changes which were attempted.

Although all of these individuals and many others made significant contributions to the project, the responsibility for this report and for the inferences drawn from the evidence presented is solely that of the authors.

William S. Griffith
Phyllis M. Cunningham
Stephen A. Treffman
September, 1971

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ii

LIST OF TABLES . . . .

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER II. HISTORY AND PLAN OF THE PROJECT AND MAJOR ASSUMPTIONS UNDERGIRDING THE EXPERIMENTAL MODEL 4

CHAPTER III. OPERATION OF THE PROJECT 12

CHAPTER IV. PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION AND SOLUTIONS: PERSPECTIVES OF THE DOOLITTLE FAMILY EDUCATION CENTER PROFESSIONAL STAFF AND STUDENTS 20

CHAPTER V. PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION AND SOLUTION: PERSPECTIVES OF THE PROJECT STAFF 50

CHAPTER VI. A REVISED IN-SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT MODEL FOR ADULT BASIC EDUCATION MULTI-AGENCY SYSTEMS 67

CHAPTER VII. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 75

APPENDIX A. PROPOSAL FOR THE PROJECT 85
B. CHICAGO BOARD OF EDUCATION REPORT. 92
C. REPORT OF NOVEMBER 7, 1970 MEETING 94
D. REPORT OF NOVEMBER 14, 1970 MEETING 102
E. REPORT OF DECEMBER 5, 1970 MEETING 119
F. REPORT OF DECEMBER 12, 1970 MEETING 134
G. REPORT OF MAY 22, 1971 MEETING 144
H. THE DOOLITTLE TASK FORCE SURVEY (WIN). . . . 166
TABLE I. CHANGES IN AMOUNT OF COMMUNICATION AMONG CONFEREES IN THE DOOLITTLE PROJECT 169
J. PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS GIVING NO ANSWER TO QUESTIONS RELATING TO COMMUNICATIONS WITH PROFESSIONALS IN THE THREE AGENCIES IN SEVEN CATEGORIES 170
K. KNOWLEDGE OF THE SYSTEM. 171
L. PROFESSIONALS' OPINION OF IMPORTANT PROBLEMS TO BE TREATED IN IN-SERVICE TRAINING 172

LIST OF TABLES

Table — Page

I. Responses to Questionnaire by Group 19

II. Extent to which Conferees were Known to Each Other at the Time of the (November 7) Conference to Begin Identifying Problems 21

III. Student Nominations of School Personnel with Whom They Would Like Interaction 23

IV. Formal Communication Between Agency Personnel and Doolittle Students as Reported by Students 23

V. Extent of Acquaintance Among Professionals in the Three Agencies as Indicated by the Numbers of Persons Listed as Being Known "To Some Extent" 24

VI. Perceptions of Students, CPS, CCDPA, and WIN Personnel on Students' Reasons for Attending School and Students' Own Reasons for Attending School 29

VII. Students' Evaluation of Professional Personnel . . . 34

VIII. Professional Staff Attitudes Reported by Group Mean on a Seven Point Scale 36

IX. Ratings of Each Group of Professionals by Group Reported by Group Mean Score 38

X. Percentage of Students and Professionals Not Perceiving Changes in their Schools 43

XI. Students' and Professionals' Perceptions of Changes Made and Desired at Their Schools 44

XII. Students' Perception of Who was Responsible for Changes Made 46

XIII. Professionals' Perception of Who was Responsible for Changes Made 46

XIV. Students' and Professionals' Perceptions of who has Authority to Make Changes Desired in Their Schools 46A

XV. Conferee's Perception of the Major Success of the Doolittle Project 48

XVI. Conferee's Perceptions of the Major Failures of the Doolittle Project 49

XVII. Statistics on Enrollment and GED Completion Obtained from the Doolittle and Midwest Centers 61

XVIII. Doolittle and Midwest Enrollment and Average Daily Attendance Figures as Obtained from CPS Central Office 61

XIX. Doolittle, Midwest Enrollment Figures as Obtained from CCDPA Central Office 62

XX. Doolittle Attendance by Teacher with Mean Ratio of Absentees to Enrollees, Standard Deviation, Range of Ratios and Median Ratio 63

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Throughout the United States and in many other parts of the world massive campaigns have been mounted for the eradication of adult illiteracy. Although national concern in the United States for the reduction of adult illiteracy has crested and ebbed at various times in the past century, currently both the Federal and state governments are expending over fifty million dollars each year in adult basic education (ABE) programs conducted under the joint sponsorship of the United States Office of Education. Probably an equal amount is used annually in illiteracy eradication carried out through departments other than Health, Education and Welfare.

Every major city has a sizeable number of adults who have not learned to read and write at an eighth grade level and an even larger number who have not earned a high school diploma or a General Educational Development (GED) Certificate. Chicago is no exception to this observation and for six years the Cook County Department of Public Aid has been involved in a variety of educational programs for welfare recipients. Some of these programs have involved the Chicago Public Schools; currently the Chicago Board of Education operates five day centers primarily to provide educational opportunities for welfare recipients. Other basic education programs are conducted under the supervision of the Board of Education in a variety of locations and at different hours of the day. Welfare recipients are also enrolled in basic education classes conducted by other organizations such as the Chicago City Colleges. Also, some of the students attending the day centers are supported by the Work Incentive Program of the Department of Labor.

Adult Basic Education (ABE) classes throughout the United States have seldom been able to demonstrate the levels of attendance and achievement to which their sponsors aspire. Where the adult students are public aid recipients as well the performance is likely to be at an even lower level. This has also been the experience of the adult education leaders of the Chicago Public Schools (CPS) and of the personnel of the Bureau of Training and Education of the Cook County Department of Public Aid (CCDPA). Both of these agencies have been concerned over the level of success they have experienced in their ABE program for welfare recipients and have sought to work together in various ways to improve their program. The establishment of a formal Joint Advisory Committee composed of professional personnel from each agency is an indication of this desire to cooperate. At the suggestion of the Joint Advisory Committee a new approach to agency cooperation in in-service training was developed and the analysis of the approach constitutes this report.

The Doolittle Family Education Center is one of five day centers operated to provide ABE to welfare recipients in Chicago. It was the focus of the experimental project.

The Doolittle Experimental In-Service Training Project is an innovative approach to adult basic education program improvement utilizing the insights and resources of all of the individuals involved in the operation of the system at the local level. It is intended not only to yield positive changes in the operation of the educational program at the Doolittle Center, but also to test the utility of a new avenue of inter-agency cooperative problem solving at the local level. ABE students, volunteers from three large bureaucracies associated with the Center (City of Chicago Public Schools - C.P.S., Cook County Department of Public Aid - C.C.D.P.A., and Work Incentive Program of the Department of Labor - WIN), and adult education graduate students and their advisor from the University of Chicago, were all engaged in this collaborative effort.

Outline of the Report

This document consisting of seven chapters and an appendix is a full final report of the Doolittle Family Education Center Experimental In-Service Training Project.

Chapter II consists of the history and plan of the project including an explanation of the framework of the model which was used to conceptualize the project.

Chapter III is a report of the sequence of events associated with the execution of the project.

Chapter IV sets forth the priority ordering of the problems and the solutions identified by the students and professional personnel associated with the Doolittle Center. In each case the amount of progress made in implementing the solutions, as perceived by the Doolittle students and professional personnel, is reported. Conclusions are presented based on these data.

Chapter V is a report of the perceptions of the project staff from the University of Chicago regarding the operation of the project. A description is given of the supplemental quantitative data collected and of the observations made. Conclusions based on these data are presented.

Chapter VI is a description of the revised model for an in-service training program for an ABE day center. It is based upon the original model outlined in Chapter II and includes those modifications which appear now to be essential based on the experiences of the staff in the Doolittle project.

Chapter VII is a listing of the conclusions reached by the project staff following their analysis of the data presented in the preceding chapters. Finally recommendations are offered regarding the improvement of the Doolittle Family Education Center Program, the Chicago ABE program and the use of the model of inter-agency cooperative in-service training in system problem-solving.

Finally, the report is concluded with an appendix which includes the original proposal, the proposal approved by the Board of Education, reports from each of the individual training meetings, the report of the WIN task force and supplementary statistical data on the project.

CHAPTER II

HISTORY AND PLAN OF THE PROJECT AND MAJOR ASSUMPTIONS UNDERGIRDING THE EXPERIMENTAL MODEL

On December 18, 1969, William S. Griffith met with the Joint Advisory Committee of the Chicago Board of Education and the Cook County Department of Public Aid at its request to present a general proposal for a staff development project. The purpose of the project was to increase the efficiency and the effectiveness of the adult basic education program through a series of in-service training meetings involving representatives of the Department of Public Aid, of the Board of Education, and of the adult students.

The Joint Advisory Committee considered the project and appointed a special ad hoc committee to advise in the further development of the proposal. The persons appointed to that advisory committee were: Don Marek, Dorothy Pelton, George Friedman, Jerry Tunney, Samuel Rosenthal and Walter Blanks.

On January 16, 1970, the ad hoc advisory committee met and, after serious discussion, endorsed the proposal[1] which rested on three primary assumptions: (1) the most important problems connected with the programs are so complex that no "authority" or "expert" could be expected to provide the solutions; (2) the major problems associated with the program are known to students, to teachers, and to Department of Public Aid staff, but their perceptions are not congruent and presently there is no effective means to facilitate communication among these groups; and (3) the deficiencies in the program are not attributable to the professional workers' or students' attitudes toward their work; rather, program weaknesses are likely to be a consequence of inadequate communication among all of the parties involved.

Based on these assumptions the following sequence of meetings was proposed to: (1) open avenues of communication; (2) foster and strengthen mutual respect and trust; and (3) facilitate cooperative planning in resolving the problems.

Meeting 1. All professional staff of CPS and CCDPA from the five day centers would be brought together to hear a chief administrator of each agency describe the most pressing problems in the program from his agency's viewpoint. The objectives of these presentations would be to acknowledge officially that major problems exist, that the rate of progress in moving toward solutions is unsatisfactory, and that the heads of the agencies see a need to improve the effectiveness of the program.

---

[1] The original proposal is shown in Appendix A.

Following these addresses, the plan for an experimental in-service staff development program would be presented. One of the conditions for participation in the experimental program would be that both the teachers and the case workers from a center must agree to take part in the program. It was assumed by the planners that adult students at any of the centers would be willing to participate. Following the explanation of the plan, the personnel from each center would meet in their own groups to consider whether they wished to volunteer for the program. From those centers which wished to participate, one experimental and one control center would be selected.

Four more one-day meetings would then be held with the professional personnel at the selected school along with a representative group of students. The plan called for small groups of approximately ten persons working together to define problems, assign priorities to the problems, and suggest solutions. The groups would work as homogeneous groupings of students, CCDPA personnel, CPS personnel, and WIN personnel,[1] and move to small heterogeneous groupings of the members from each of the four groups in their later sessions. The specific plans for each of the next four meetings follow.

Meeting 2. In the first actual work session the four homogeneous groups would identify the problems associated with the program from their perspective, describe the problems and assign the problem to a rank on a priority listing. These completed lists, developed with the assistance of project staff who served as chairmen and recorders, would be duplicated and mailed to all conferees prior to Meeting 3.

Meeting 3. Having read and thought about the problems identified from each of four perspectives, the participants would meet in their homogeneous groups to attempt to map out procedures to overcome the problems they had listed earlier. While some groups might decide to reorder their list of problems, all groups would be working on what they believed to be the best solutions to the problems. At the end of the third meeting the participants should have succeeded in outlining practical solutions to the problems they had listed.

It seems reasonable to assume that the solutions proposed would entail a modification of behavior on the part of the individuals in all four groups. Therefore the reports of each of the four groups would be of considerable interest to those being asked to change their behavior. Recorders would prepare the reports for duplication and distribution prior to the subsequent meeting.

---

[1] WIN personnel were not included in the original proposal but were included after the first presentation to the Joint Advisory Committee (JAC) when WIN observers of the JAC indicated a strong desire to be a part of the project.

Meeting 4. A representative from each of the four groups would present the report and recommendations from his group to the entire body of participants. Administrators from the experimental school and the central office would be invited to hear these reports and to be available to give clarifying information and to ask questions. Administrators would be asked to refrain from giving answers, solutions or in any way commenting on the appropriateness of the lists.

At this point administrators would leave and the participants would be divided into four discussion groups composed of equal numbers of students, CPS, CCDPA and WIN personnel. The responsibility of the discussion groups would be to take the information from all four homogeneous groups and from the panel discussion and to arrive at a listing of problems and solutions agreeable to all members of the group. Copies of the reports of each group prepared by the project staff would be reproduced and given to all of the participants.

Meeting 5. At the fifth meeting the participants would examine the reports of the four discussion groups and arrive at a consensus regarding: (1) the priority ordering of the problems, and (2) the approach to be used in working toward the solutions.

When the group reached consensus on the priority listing of the problems and the manner of attacking each one, administrators of both agencies would be available to answer questions regarding the limitations or restrictions which might rule out any of the solutions listed. Further, these administrators should be able to commit additional agency resources where appropriate.

Following the fifth meeting the participants would have a plan of attack and would set out to implement the plan. Activity would be monitored by personnel of the University of Chicago who would also be collecting data from one or more centers not involved in the experiment.

Meeting 6. After an appropriate interval following the fifth meeting, the members of the group would assemble for a day to evaluate progress and to make a judgment on the adequacy of the approach. From a practical standpoint the results of the sixth meeting should be the determination of the value of the program and the judgment of whether or not it should be expanded.

Before moving to a consideration of the actual operation of the project it may be instructive to examine the factors which led to the proposing of the training program. In addition it may be informative to reconsider the factors and interests which led to the involvement of each of the agencies and of the adult education graduate students and their advisor from the University of Chicago. Finally the major assumptions which served as a framework for the development of the training program are stated.

The Doolittle Experimental In-Service Training Project grew out of three complementary interests. First, the adult education leaders of the City of Chicago Public Schools were interested in taking corrective action to improve the performance of the adult basic education programs conducted under their direction. Second, the Director and the Education and Training Staff of the Cook County Department of Public Aid were concerned about the apparent limited effectiveness of the adult basic education programs in serving the needs of public aid recipients. Third, the project director was interested in the reported limited effectiveness of adult basic education programs nationally and was intrigued by the possibility of attempting to utilize an intervention model which might lead to marked changes in the structure and function of such programs. These three interests came together through the medium of the Joint Advisory Committee, which had been established approximately five years earlier at the urging of the project director.

From the vantage point of the Chicago Board of Education the key indicators of the problem were the relatively low attendance records. This problem with attendance was also reflected in the rate of progress of students through the program. The possible ineffective use of an inappropriate curriculum involving unsuitable teaching materials was seen as the probable cause of the unsatisfactory attendance and achievement records. Within the school system there may also have been a tendency to trace all problems back to what was perceived as a lack of student motivation. In part there may have been a belief that the difficulties arose from a single cause, a belief that has been shown to be untenable.

Within the Cook County Department of Public Aid administrators were observing the mounting welfare rolls with increasing concern. Further they appeared to be concerned at the rate of student progress through the adult basic education program and what was seen as an inability of the school staff to motivate students and thus maintain an acceptable attendance level. Accordingly, the Director of the Bureau of Education and Training, Mr. Herbert Herman was seeking a promising way to intervene in the educational program in a constructive way.

The project director, who had studied adult basic education programs in a number of states and who had read quite a few evaluation reports which had been written on such programs, was convinced that no single variable or simple set of variables would be adequate to cause the present level of attendance and achievement and that consequently the problems could not be solved satisfactorily through the manipulation of one or a small number of variables. Both achievement and attendance have been shown to involve an intricate set of complicated interactions among a number of variables.

Efforts at improving the operation of adult basic education programs in the United States have been notably unsuccessful. Possibly the reason for the limited success of program improvement efforts is that they have been based on too simplistic a model for conceptualizing the problem. In other words, if the output is actually dependent on many variables working independently and in interaction, any effort intended to influence that output appreciably which concentrates on the manipulation of a single variable is unlikely to yield any appreciable impact.

Models of in-service training and of other program improvement efforts in adult basic education have characteristically emphasized the operation of a single, or at best a small number of variables. The project director and his students had been involved previously at different times in in-service training efforts with the personnel of the Chicago Board of Education and with personnel involved in the training support arm of the Cook County Department of Public Aid. Also, the director was aware of in-service training efforts which had been conducted in other locations and had noted the apparent lack of impact of such efforts.

Conventional in-service training programs are usually conducted within a single agency exclusively for its own personnel. Administrators working independently or with the advice of a planning committee typically identify what seems to be the most important problem in the program and then invite an external expert to come in and lecture on this keystone variable. The common assumption is that the personnel in the program merely need to be told the right answer or the right approach and they will return to their posts and perform with increased efficiency.

Training programs frequently are developed using the assumption that teachers have little to contribute to the instructional part of the program. That is, the purpose of the training is seen as providing answers to those who lack them. Seldom is provision made to utilize the knowledge, insights and skills of the teachers themselves in devising the right answer.

Student involvement is an aspect of the educational process which has been receiving increasing attention in confrontation-plagued universities, but the notion that students can play roles other than that of adversary has gained only limited acceptance. Even when students become involved in a discussion with school authorities regarding the educational program, the students' role is usually to voice their unhappiness with the teachers, the instruction, and the curriculum. Rarely are teachers and students involved in a discussion as co-workers in an educational system, a situation that calls for a mutual examination of strengths and weaknesses and leads to a self-initiated modification of behavior by both parties. Further, it seems unfortunate that welfare recipients who typically have not had the opportunity to develop their skills as committee members and as effective members of democratically organized discussion groups are usually denied the opportunity to learn these skills as a part of their basic education program.

Assumptions of the Model

With these considerations in mind the project director conceptualized the model for the experimental in-service training program. The assumptions on which the model rests are as follows:

(1) Adult basic education is typically conducted in a complex situation requiring interactions within and among a number of agencies and groups of students. Improvement efforts which consider this fact are more likely to be successful than those which use a simpler idea of the system involved.

(2) The solution of a problem in an adult basic education program by an external agent does not necessarily increase the capacity of the program personnel to solve other problems in the future. Accordingly system development efforts which focus on increasing the capacity of the system to deal with its own problems are of greater value than comparable investments of effort which may enable an external agent to solve a problem but which do not influence the skills of those who operate the system routinely.

(3) The individuals who are working at the operating level within a system are better acquainted with the operating level problems of that system than their administrative superior who must, by virtue of his position, direct his attention to other parts of the larger system as well. Accordingly an effort directed toward the identification of operating level problems will be most effective if it includes a provision for the involvement of operating level personnel in problem identification in a non-threatening environment.

(4) In general, the majority of individuals working within a system are interested in doing a good job. Further, professional personnel involved in recruiting, counseling and teaching adult basic education students are willing to volunteer

in sufficient numbers to participate in a cooperative program to make such an effort feasible. Therefore adults should be given the opportunity to volunteer in such programs rather than being told to participate.

(5) Program improvement efforts are an integral part of the operation of any vital program. Therefore if personnel are expected to participate in such efforts outside their regular working hours it is legitimate to pay them for such services.

(6) Bureaucracies, by virtue of operating characteristics which have been identified clearly since the time of Weber, do not foster and support openness of communication either intra- or inter-organizationally. Instead emphasis is placed on sending all messages exclusively through official channels. Accordingly programs which are designed to improve communication within and among bureaucracies involved in adult basic education programs need to foster the use of unofficial communication channels.

(7) Student attendance and academic achievement in adult basic education programs are readily quantified. Because of this characteristic they have been emphasized as indicators of the effectiveness and efficiency of adult education programs far more than less tangible or less readily quantifiable outcomes. Any plan of improvement for adult basic education programs may entail the use of multiple indices of performance and should use caution in assessing the importance of any single indicator.

(8) Adult basic education students are able and willing to elect or otherwise designate representatives to perform clearly identified functions. Accordingly when student representatives are desired to participate in program efforts the student group should be told what is needed and then permitted to select their representatives democratically.

(9) There is unused freedom for personnel at the operating level of agencies involved in adult basic education programs to exercise initiative in program improvement. Therefore efforts designed to stimulate the exercise of an increased amount of initiative at the operating level need first to convince the individuals involved that such freedom exists.

(10) Appreciable improvement can be made at the local level in the operation of a system involving three bureaucracies without the involvement of administrative initiative from another level of one or more of the bureaucracies involved.

(11) The individuals working within the system are capable of identifying solutions which they can implement.

(12) The individuals who have participated in the cooperative identification and priority ranking of problems and of the solutions which they can implement will be motivated to execute those proposed solutions.

(13) The involvement of an external agent--in this case the project director and his team--is required to overcome the latent distrust the personnel of each agency have for their counterparts in the other agencies. Without the intervention of the external agent or consultant, no single agency is likely to feel free to take the initiative in calling the other agency personnel and representatives of the students together to begin the cooperative problem-solving effort.

(14) Students and the personnel of the three agencies who have successfully engaged in cooperative problem identification and solution will have developed the requisite attitude of confidence and will have accepted the idea that individual initiative and informal interagency cooperation are both possible and productive for problem-solving within a complex system. Accordingly, having internalized these values, they will continue to use this approach in dealing with other problems as they arise.

(15) Agency personnel and students who have been involved in a cooperative inter-agency problem identification and solution effort at the local level will attempt to solve future problems at the local level rather than waiting for administrators at the higher levels of the institutional hierarchies to take the initiative.

(16) A cooperative process of problem identification will call attention to dysfunctional aspects of the system and will provide administrators with information which might not be brought to their attention under other circumstances. Consequently system improvements may be stimulated indirectly as well as through the active efforts of students and professionals at the local level.

These assumptions led to the development of the experimental in-service training model whose application is presented in Chapter III.

CHAPTER III

OPERATION OF THE PROJECT

After the Joint Advisory Committee and its special in-service training ad-hoc advisory committee had accepted the basic assumptions of the experimental in-service training project,[1] the next task was to conduct the meetings. In this chapter a brief report of the operation of those meetings is presented, followed by additional background information on the perspectives of the University of Chicago personnel regarding the project. The chapter concludes with an overview of the number of individuals who participated in the pre- and post-tests at the experimental and control adult basic education day centers.

The first meeting was planned for the annual Institute Day of the Chicago Adult Day Centers on July 10, 1970. At that meeting a majority of the representatives of three of the five centers voted to have their school serve as the experimental center. Subsequently the Doolittle Family Education Center was selected as the experimental center and the Midwest Family Education Center was selected as the control center. Because the clientele served by the Montrose center was not felt to be directly comparable to those at Doolittle or Midwest, it was not included in the project even though a majority of the representatives of that center had volunteered. The University of Chicago project team met with each of the professional groups at Doolittle as well as with the WIN team members, to again outline the project to make it possible for any staff members who might not have attended the July 10 meeting to volunteer for the project. Ten teachers, 9 CCDPA staff members, and 16 WIN workers volunteered. To keep the groups of comparable size only 10 of the WIN workers were selected. They were chosen in a way that assured that all positions on the team would be represented. The Student Council at Doolittle was asked to decide how to identify ten representatives from the student body. The Student Council decided that volunteers would be sought from the Council and by this means the student representatives were selected.

A formal proposal was presented to the Chicago Board of Education after funding had been obtained by Dr. Lehmann, Assistant Superintendent of Extension Education, CPS, from the

---

[1] See Appendix A.

Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI); final approval by the Board of Education was given in October, 1970.[1]

Meetings 2 and 3 were held November 7 and 14 and meetings 4 and 5 were held December 5 and 12 at the Center for Continuing Education on the campus of the University of Chicago.[2] All participants were paid for attending the conferences. The final plan which emerged from the meetings was distributed to all participants and their administrators in January, 1971. The participants were advised that an effort would be made to assess progress on May 22.[3] It was assumed by the project staff that each participant knew of at least one solution he personally was expected to attempt to implement. The project was reported back to all centers at the annual Institute Day by the project participants on July 16.

The Doolittle Family Education Center agency volunteers, student representatives and project staff attended four one-day conferences over a period of four weeks (November 7 through December 12, 1970) for the purpose of constructing a priority-ordered listing of problems and plans of action which were expected to lead to the solution of these problems. The volunteers from the three agencies had apparently made no beforehand preparation for the first meeting, but the student representatives had. In fact, the students had brought a quantity of dittoed lists of "Grievances of the Students," an indication of their interest in the project and the belief that their problems would receive attention.

The eleven "grievances" which the student representatives brought to the meeting were:

1. We want books on a higher reading level for the GED Department.
2. We want better academic shops.
3. We should have 16 weeks in all the shops, instead of 8 weeks.
4. We want our WIN checks to arrive on time, since we have to sign in and out.
5. Supply the Academic Department with sufficient books.
6. We want a clerical shop with adding machines and office equipment.

---

[1] See Appendix B.

[2] The complete reports from each of these four meetings can be found in Appendices C, D, E and F.

[3] The report for the May 22 meeting is shown in Appendix G.

7. We feel that the lunch money should be increased. If not, give the students free lunches.

8. The male students need an additional washroom.

9. Teachers should have a workshop where they can learn how to present materials in an understanding manner.

10. We feel that the program should be organized as a high school. When we receive our GED, we feel we should have a graduation exercise.

11. We feel we should have a review on what we have been taught at the end of each week.

Although the students were the only group who came prepared with a list of grievances, it became apparent that all groups exhibited a tendency to state their conception of the problems in a grievance manner.[1] The problems tended to be stated in an arbitrary way with blame assigned either to other groups or to unseen forces outside the institution. In general the lists of problems rarely, if ever, were couched in terms which indicated that the group making the list was prepared to accept responsibility for contributing to any problem situation or to assume responsibility for correcting any. Despite the efforts of the planners to foster a cooperative attitude, at the initial meetings, the participants appeared to assume adversary postures.

During the second session the project staff encouraged the groups toward more self-examination and to be more candid in admitting their own shortcomings. Discussion during the second session was less heated and tended to be more thoughtful and productive. In some cases participants indicated surprise at the outlook expressed in the problem listings prepared by the other groups both in terms of the kinds of problems identified and the priorities assigned to the problems. In the second meeting there was a relisting of problems and in some cases a less accusatory tone was apparent.

During the third meeting all participants met as a single group for the first time and listened to the groups' reports. Administrators of the three agencies were invited and their presence was for the most part very helpful. Mr. Vernon Miller, Assistant Director of Education Extension for the Chicago Board of Education, assured all participants that supplies were readily available, if the school principal would order them. Further, he stated that the Board of Education policy was not only to encourage the ordering of all needed books but also to provide a sufficient quantity to enable students to take materials home. Mr. Herbert Herman, Chief, Bureau of Education and Training, CCDPA, pointed out that CCDPA had legal constraints regarding the size of food and clothing allowances. He encouraged any person who felt allowances were assigned arbitrarily to seek redress since agency policy clearly prohibited capricious determination of allowances. The effect of Mr. Miller's announcements on the teacher and WIN group was noticeable. The group expressed a sense of disbelief following his announcement and raised questions to make sure they had understood him correctly. The students appeared shocked at Mr. Miller's announcement since the shortage of instructional material had been a long-term problem for them. Mr. Jerome Brown, Illinois Director of the WIN program, indicated candidly that WIN was considering withdrawing enrollees from Doolittle if there were not more progress shown in attendance and achievement. His announcement, together with the open challenging of the value of the shops and followed by Mr. Miller's comment that curriculum decisions were largely made on the local level appeared to raise anxiety among teachers who understandably wondered what implications these announcements had for them. It was pointed out that the central office delegated considerable discretionary power to the local school regarding curriculum.

---

[1] See Appendix C.

When the four groups were reassembled following the panel discussion in this third meeting, a definite change appeared to occur in the quality of the discussions. For the first time representatives of each group were given the task of reaching consensus on the priority assignment of problems on a list, and on the proposed solutions to each of the problems. The group members worked very hard and encountered difficulty in resolving differences. Many times discussion of the problems had to be set aside as one group member would question another member as to exactly what he did and what was his agency's policy. A great deal of information was exchanged throughout the day which appeared to increase the level of both intra- and inter-group knowledge about programs, policies and procedures.

During the morning of the fourth session, participants refined the lists of problems and by afternoon arrived at a consensus on the problems, priorities and solutions. It was the feeling of the project staff that morale within the group was high and that for the most part representatives from each group were much more aware of the complex nature of the problems and much less willing to accuse members of other groups of causing these problems.

At the final session on May 22, 1971, the conferees reconvened with administrators to report on the implementation of the project. Up to this time there had been almost 100% attendance at the meetings. At this final meeting two teachers and three CCDPA personnel who were still employed at the school were absent. One teacher and one WIN worker had left their positions and were therefore missing. All students still at the school were present and three of the four students who had graduated or who were no longer enrolled were present despite the fact that they were not presently at Doolittle. This drop in Doolittle professionals' attendance appeared to stem from two causes: Two teachers felt the voluntary nature of the project was not adhered to completely when field staff urged them as conference participants to return questionnaires even if questions which they felt were too personal or not relevant were left unanswered. This urging was interpreted as a violation of their voluntary participation and one teacher specifically indicated a withdrawal from the project if this was the case. The other teacher indicated a feeling of hostility regarding the questionnaire and did not turn it in and appeared upset at being asked to turn in the questionnaire regardless of unanswered questions.

The three CCDPA personnel, who had been enthusiastic and most cooperative throughout the project, indicated personal depression with the inability to bring change about in their agency and in the opinion of the project staff the disengagement from the project evaluation seemed related to their feeling of a lack of accomplishment.

The agenda for the final meeting was essentially devoted to a reporting back on each problem.

Throughout the project primary emphasis was placed on the perceptions of the students and the professional personnel at Doolittle regarding the effects of the project. The opinions of administrators from the offices of the CPS, the CCDPA and the WIN program were also sought.

Members of the project team approached the experimental in-service effort with certain ideas about the probable source of the problems and of factors which impede cooperative problem-solving efforts. In the following section these preconceived notions are identified.

Participation of Personnel of the University of Chicago

Faculty and graduate students of the Department of Education were deeply involved in the project from its inception. During the series of one-day meetings they served as discussion leaders, to make certain that all participants were allowed an opportunity to speak and were encouraged to do so. They also served as recorders, to be sure that a record of the discussions would be made without burdening any of the participants of the group with this responsibility and perhaps reducing their freedom to participate.

From a research standpoint the graduate students were instructed to assist in the assessment of the efforts of members of the experimental group to work toward the attainment of their agreed-upon objectives.

More specifically the university personnel sought to collect data on the experimental center prior to and following the implementation of the plan of action to result from the fifth meeting. Further, comparable data were to be collected from the control center. Finally, the university representatives were charged with the responsibility of analyzing, interpreting and reporting the data to assess the potential of this design for use in other day centers and evening programs of adult basic education in Chicago and elsewhere.

In preparing the graduate student team for its research task the project director presented his tentative analysis of the situation as follows.

There is a general consensus among administrators of the Chicago Public Schools (CPS), the Cook County Department of Public Aid (CCDPA), and representatives of the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) that the operation of two major agencies--CCDPA and the Work Incentive Program of the Department of Labor (WIN) complicated the life of the ABE student and the operation of the Center. These agencies, funded under separate governmental units and with differing perspectives on desirable educational outcomes for the clientele, have increased the complexity and lessened the flexibility of the CPS personnel in doing their traditional work of educating adults in a broad educational framework. It is assumed that this is not because there is a lack of competency or motivation of professional personnel to do their work. Rather, the problem seems to spring from (1) a lack of clearly defined educational objectives among the three agencies for the clientele; (2) a lack of knowledge about the operation and objectives of the three agencies among its professional staff; and (3) a lack of communication networks (formal and informal) which would provide mechanisms for expediting the educational process among the three agencies for the best interests of the clientele.

Two of the agencies (CPS and CCDPA) are housed on the premises of the Doolittle Center and through the eight years of its existence have developed working relationships even though procedures for sharing information and of cooperative problem solving have been cared for only in part. With the arrival of the WIN program, housed off the premises and with a presumably highly decentralized organization, added strains have developed within the center.

Superimposed on these problems is a changing conceptualization of the role of the client. For a variety of reasons there seems to be a growing awareness among professionals in all three agencies that the client should have a say in (a) the appropriate goals of the system for the clients, and (b) how the program is designed to meet these goals.

University Personnel Data Gathering Perspectives

Data gathering activities were aimed at providing evidence to use in answer to the following questions:

1. What are the existing facilities, personnel, and administrative structures, policies and procedures of the three agencies at the Doolittle and Midwest Centers (prior to January 1, 1971)?

2. What are the formal and informal organizational structures within, between and among the three agencies which serve to facilitate or to hinder communication?

3. What are the problems and the priorities of these problems as seen by the four groups as they develop a plan of action?

4. How would the adoption of the proposed solutions affect (a) the educational outcomes of the program, and (b) the communication patterns among personnel within and among the agencies?

Data Collection Procedures

The data collection was accomplished in two ways. Based on the above questions, questionnaires were developed for both students and professional personnel. All professional personnel stationed at Doolittle and Midwest and operational level WIN personnel were asked to complete the questionnaire. A random sample of 100 students plus the Student Council members at Doolittle and Midwest were also selected to complete the questionnaires. The questionnaires were administered by the project team in December and again in May. The percentage of responses from each group are presented in Table I. Student attendance was a factor restricting the potential student response to the questionnaires.

A second method of data collection was by means of field observations and interviews. Administrators, professional personnel and students were interviewed; observations of classes, in-service meetings and activities were made; statistical information on student attendance and achievement were gathered.

The reporting of these data collected by the project staff along with the reports of the conferees and administrators are reported in Chapter IV, organized around the priority-ordered list of problems and solutions devised by the conferees during the four conference days in November and December, 1970.

TABLE I

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE BY GROUP

D = Doolittle M = Midwest

		PRE-TEST		POST-TEST	
	Number in group	Number of Respondents	Percent of Respondents	Number of Respondents	Percent of Respondent
D - Students	110	64	58%	30	27%
M - Students	110	45	41%	12	11%
D - CPS[1]	20	16	80%	13	65%
M - CPS[1]	20	17	85%	12	60%
D - CCDPA[2]	11	10	91%	7	64%
M - CCDPA	12	5	42%	3	25%
WIN	87	50	58%	29	33%

[1] Includes Teachers Aides

[2] Includes secretaries

CHAPTER IV

PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION AND SOLUTIONS: PERSPECTIVES OF THE DOOLITTLE FAMILY EDUCATION CENTER PROFESSIONAL STAFF AND STUDENTS

Through their participation in the four meetings held in November and December, 1970, the representatives of the students and the volunteers from the Chicago Board of Education, the Cook County Department of Public Aid and the Work Incentive Program of the Department of Labor identified seven problems and over thirty solutions for those problems. In this chapter each of the seven problems will be presented followed by a report of accomplishments based on an assessment of the perceptions of the students and the professional personnel of the three cooperating agencies. These perceptions were obtained through discussions which occurred at a progress evaluation meeting on May 22, 1971, and at the Adult Basic Education Third Institute Day of the Chicago Board of Education on July 16, 1971. Additional quantitative data collected by the project staff relating directly to those problems are also presented.

Problem 1

There is a lack of effective communication within and among the three agencies involved in the program of the Doolittle Family Education Center on a day-to-day basis.

This problem was given highest priority by the participants. Suggested solutions included regular meetings across agencies at the operational and administrative levels including students; preparation of a guidebook; development of an orientation program for students, including all agencies; development of orientation and regular in-service programs for agency personnel; and making provision for WIN personnel to be physically based at the school.

There is clear evidence from many sources that communication within and between agencies and between agencies and students has been and continues to be a major problem at Doolittle. Evidence from the control school and from discussions held during the July 16, 1971, Institute Day indicate that this problem is not confined to Doolittle. Particularly this is true regarding WIN and school-based personnel. Geographic proximity and administrative style appear to affect the quantity and quality of communications at the operational level.

Information on communication problems came from several sources. At the conferences especially when small groups were divided heterogeneously, there was a far greater amount of information-seeking behavior among group members than where groups were organized homogeneously. A questionnaire given conferees also provided information about communication problems at the operational level. Conferees were asked to identify those persons whom they had known prior to the conference and to indicate whether they had discussed any situation at Doolittle with each of these persons. There were four groups with approximately ten persons in each group. Assuming that there is knowledge of and communication between members of any one group, only percentages higher than 25 per cent would indicate inter-agency communication. The data revealed that of the 41 persons responding to the questionnaire, most were known to fewer than 20 of the people at the conference. A notable exception to this pattern was one CCDPA worker known to 70% of the conferees prior to the conference. These data are reported in Table II.[1]

TABLE II

EXTENT TO WHICH CONFEREES WERE KNOWN TO EACH OTHER AT THE TIME OF THE (NOVEMBER 7) CONFERENCE TO BEGIN IDENTIFYING PROBLEMS
(Reported by Percentage)

Group	Conferees Acquainted with Members of This Group		Conferees Who had Discussed a Problem at Doolittle with a Member of this Group	
	Average	Range	Average	Range
CCDPA	45	30-72	21	15-33
CPS	56	47-62	20	13-35
Students	50	45-62	18	13-23
WIN	39	32-55	15	5-20

The higher percentages for the members in the CCDPA, student and CPS groups is not surprising because they are all regularly carrying out their responsibilities at the Doolittle Family Education Center. WIN personnel for the most part had not been to the Center and are not required to go there. In light of the limited contact of the members of the conference group with each other prior to the conference as indicated by their discussions at the conference it is likely that all of the percentages are somewhat inflated but there is no apparent reason for any systematic bias in these data.

---

[1] Appendix J contains the complete report of these data.

The WIN liaison has the responsibility of serving as a communication link between the WIN program personnel and the students and professional staff at Doolittle. Despite this designation of function, 45 per cent of the conferees were not acquainted with the liaison and 23 per cent reported that they had discussed a situation at Doolittle with the liaison person. If it can be assumed that the conferees reported being somewhat better acquainted with each other than they actually were, it seems that the liaison function between WIN and Doolittle is being carried on with only a limited number of the Doolittle students and staff. No data were collected to enable the project staff to determine the extent to which this situation is typical of the relationships of the other four day centers with WIN. However discussions at the meetings suggest that wide variation exists in the way that the WIN program relates to each of the centers.

At the broader base of respondents in the two schools and at WIN this same pattern held true. In the questionnaire an attempt was made to get at the informal and formal communication patterns within the agencies and between agency and students. First, students were asked to list three persons they would like to: (1) have for a classroom teacher; (2) have for a shop teacher; (3) talk to about a personal problem; (4) talk to regarding an idea to improve the school; (5) talk to about a money problem; (6) talk to regarding a complaint about the school; and (7) talk to about his future hopes and plans.[1] In both schools there was a marked increase in the students' ability or willingness to write three names in response to each question which may indicate a general socialization factor at work. However, on the post-test, Doolittle students were able and willing to name more teachers from whom they would like to take a class or shop or talk to about a personal problem, than were the students at Midwest as illustrated in Table III.

Students at the conference and those interviewed on field visits reported that there was a much better rapport between most students and most teachers at the end of the project than previously. Doolittle students also reported to the field team a greater willingness of teachers to communicate with students regarding their achievement and to explain mistakes on homework. The questionnaire data neither support nor refute this perception since the number of students dropped markedly between

---

[1] Appendix K contains the complete report of these data.

TABLE III

STUDENT NOMINATIONS OF SCHOOL PERSONNEL WITH WHOM THEY WOULD LIKE INTERACTION

(Reported by Percentage)

Questionnaire item	PRE-TEST		POST-TEST	
	Doolittle	Midwest	Doolittle	Midwest
	(N=64)	(N=45)	(N=30)	(N=12)
I would like to take a class from	65	61	82	69
I would like to take a shop from	33	35	53	47
I would like to talk over a personal problem	44	40	61	48

pre- and post-data collection making statistically sound comparisons impossible.[1] Data on communication between students and all professional personnel show fairly consistent patterns. Differences in the number of students responding to the questions on the post-test make comparisons with the pre-test tenuous.

TABLE IV

FORMAL COMMUNICATION BETWEEN AGENCY PERSONNEL AND DOOLITTLE STUDENTS AS REPORTED BY STUDENTS

(Reported by Percentage)

Agency	Students Reporting They had Received at least One Formal Communication From the Following Groups			
	PRE-TEST		POST-TEST	
	Doolittle	Midwest	Doolittle	Midwest
	(N=64)	(N=30)	(N=45)	(N=12)
CCDPA	60	72	57	25
CPS	60	46	63	50
WIN	28	26	26	17

---

[1] Comparisons between pre- and post-test data will be made only in the cases of Doolittle CPS, Doolittle CCDPA, and Midwest CPS, since the number of respondents on the pre- and post-questionnaire are comparable; comparisons among all other groups will be confined to a comparison of pre-test data or a comparison of post-test data rather than a comparison between pre- and post-test data.

The lower percentages for WIN are to be expected because fewer than half of the students at Doolittle or Midwest are enrolled in WIN. Although the data do not lead to significant conclusions, the detailed data on which this summary table is based are presented in Appendix J for descriptive purposes.

Agency personnel were also asked to indicate how well they knew other agency personnel by listing the names of ten persons they knew in their own agency as well as in the other two agencies. The responses to these questions are shown in Table V.

TABLE V

EXTENT OF ACQUAINTANCE AMONG PROFESSIONALS IN THE THREE AGENCIES AS INDICATED BY THE NUMBERS OF PERSONS LISTED AS BEING KNOWN "TO SOME EXTENT

Agencies and Location	Professionals' Extent of Knowledge of the Potential Number of Professional Personnel Who Could be Known in Three Agencies.							
	Number of Possible Choices		CPS %		CCDPA %		WIN[1] %	
	Pre-test	Post-test	Pre-test	Post-test	Pre-test	Post-test	Pre-test	Post-test
CPS Doolittle	(N=16) 160	(N=13) 130	78	88	13	36	4	10
Midwest	(N=17) 170	(N=12) 120	76	86	25	60	1	2
CCDPA Doolittle	(N=10) 100	(N=7) 70	40	61	93	96	12	16
Midwest	(N=5) 50	(N=3) 30	56	90	94	90	52	70
WIN	(N=50) 500	(N=26) 260	0.4	2	2	4 (10)[1]	90 (30)[1]	90

---

[1] Although WIN personnel responded at a 2% (pre) and a 4% (post) level to knowledge of public aid personnel at Doolittle and Midwest, they were able to respond at a 10% (pre) and a 30% (post) level for public aid personnel within the WIN office or at WIN outposts located in CCDPA district offices.

Respondents were more able and/or willing to list persons known within their own agency; Public Aid and WIN personnel were able to correctly name persons within their own agency at least 90 per cent of the time. CPS personnel reported knowing one another less than personnel in the other two agencies reported knowing personnel in their agencies. CPS personnel's knowledge of Public Aid personnel is less than Public Aid personnel's knowledge of CPS personnel. CPS personnel do not know WIN personnel; CCDPA know WIN personnel somewhat; but the overwhelming conclusion is that WIN does not know CPS or CCDPA personnel based at the school. On the other hand, WIN was able to identify CCDPA personnel who are stationed as liaisons in their office or who work as outpost representatives to recruit for WIN. Doolittle CPS personnel were more acquainted with WIN personnel than were Midwest CPS personnel; Midwest Public Aid personnel were strikingly more knowledgeable of WIN personnel than were Doolittle Public Aid personnel. The small increases of WIN personnel's knowledge of CPS personnel and school-based CCDPA personnel may be accounted for by acquaintance developing during the Doolittle Project.

In terms of what was reported back at the conference regarding changes which had been suggested by the conferees, several results were noted. The suggested solutions are presented followed in each case by a report of action taken.

Solution 1. Central administrators from the three agencies should meet together with students. Central administrative personnel and principals did meet but without students and not for the express purpose of discussing the recommendation from the Doolittle project. At the time of the evaluation meeting none of the participants seemed to be aware of the meeting or what had transpired at it.

This meeting was attended by members of the project team who noted that the Doolittle project was the major topic discussed although it was not formally on the agenda. Mr. Murphy, Principal of the Hilliard Day Center, was at that time acting principal of Doolittle and he reported on changes he had made in the curriculum. An abbreviated list of suggested solutions taken from the December 12 meeting report had been prepared and was distributed by Mr. Herman. There was little discussion of solutions at this meeting although there was a great deal of reporting by each agency of actions taken since the start of the project.

Solution 2. Preparation of a guidebook. Within the WIN agency and the CPS, materials were circulated at the time of the project regarding objectives as stated in the new Peer Group Concept at WIN and the Curriculum Guide for the Programs of Adult Basic Education for Teachers. No attempt has been made to exchange informative literature by any agency with the other two agencies. WIN does have two detailed descriptive pieces on the WIN program which were given to the project team. A detailed descriptive article on WIN appeared in Public Aid in Illinois during the time of the project. As far as can be ascertained, very little attempt, if any, has been made by any of the three agencies to provide whatever literature they have to the other agencies.

Solution 3. Orientation program for students involving the three agencies. The orientation program at Doolittle has been strengthened with an informal coffee hour at which CCDPA personnel are introduced and their functions explained and Student Council members make oral presentations and give tours of the physical plant.

Solution 4. Orientation program initiated based on the guidebook for professional personnel in all three agencies. No formal orientation program taking into account the three agencies has been devised in any of the three agencies. At the Doolittle school, only two new professional people have joined the staff and they are both administrators: a supervising case worker and the current principal.

An orientation session held for WIN personnel at the Cook County Central Office was attended by a project staff member. At this session no specific reference was made to the five adult day centers. From the point of view of the project staff member, in the explanation of the historic development of CCDPA-WIN cooperative ventures there was an overtone of negative references which might easily have encouraged negative attitudes on the part of new employees.

Solution 5. In-service training for professionals in the three agencies. Doolittle teachers have had several in-service training meetings since January. At two of these meetings CCDPA staff were invited. One teacher attended a regional two-week training program for ABE teachers. No formal in-service training of the type described by the participants has been initiated by CCDPA or WIN, although presently WIN has been engaged in an intensive agency-wide re-training program to acquaint their staff with the new organization of WIN and the peer group concept, an approach which calls for a change in the method of developing employability plans.

An assembly was held at Doolittle for all students and personnel to explain new policies and procedures, to acquaint students with the Student Council and to encourage them to support and utilize it. The Doolittle Student Council was elected following that meeting and was officially recognized as the Local Educational Council by the CPS administration. (The Student Council will be referred to in more detail later in the report.)

Solution 6. Assign all Doolittle WIN students to one WIN team. This was regarded by the agency administrators as impossible and the Cook County WIN director, Mr. White, proposed an alternate solution. This solution requires a WIN representative to spend two or three days each week at Doolittle. The Doolittle Project did serve to document the fact that only 17 per cent of the student respondents from Doolittle (26 per cent from Midwest) had had formal communication from a WIN worker while 28 per cent of the students from Doolittle (40 per cent from Midwest) could name a WIN worker. Although only a minority of the students were enrolled in the WIN program, these data seemed to indicate that an even smaller minority of students had had any personal interaction with WIN. WIN therefore sent a team of four workers to do an analysis of WIN students attending Doolittle.[1] It was at this point that WIN discovered why students seemed to be so unaware of their team. WIN has a status sheet in which one category is "training"; when a new enrollee has been interviewed and an employability plan is made and a training program agreed upon, the enrollee goes into the training category. Since training takes some time, the progress of WIN enrollees in the "training" category are not reviewed as frequently as for WIN enrollees in other categories. Students referred directly from the adult centers were already in training and therefore placed in this category. Their cases were not reviewed as it was erroneously assumed that an employability plan had been developed for each of them prior to their beginning training. The WIN Task Force found that "almost none of those participating at the institution in the WIN program had any definite employability plan. . ."

Based on the project data and the internal study conducted by WIN it was decided that all basic education students in WIN will be assigned to two special teams whose members will be responsible for working closely with such students to facilitate rapid progress through this aspect of training. As was mentioned previously, Mr. White has announced his intention of having a WIN team member spend two to three days a week at the Doolittle Family Education Center.

Problem 2

There is a lack of understanding among personnel within the agencies regarding the objectives of the program.

It became apparent during the conference that participants held distinctly different views regarding the purpose of the

---

[1] See Appendix H for the complete WIN Task Force Report.

Doolittle educational program. Table VI presents data from Doolittle and Midwest illustrating that personnel from both schools and WIN differ on what they perceive to be the purpose of the school's educational program.

Professionals were asked to respond to the extent that they agreed with the statement, "A student should finish his GED even if he can go to work and get off welfare."[1] All professionals tended to agree with this statement which again would seem somewhat contradictory to CCDPA's and WIN's stated policies.

Students were asked to approximate the time it would take for them to obtain their GED. Approximately 16 per cent of the students from both schools did not respond to this question, about 30 per cent from both schools said one year, 5 per cent from Doolittle and 15 per cent from Midwest said two to four years, 6 per cent from Doolittle and 2 per cent from Midwest said eight years, while 43 per cent from Doolittle and 33 per cent from Midwest responded that they "didn't know" or "forever," or statements to that effect. A number of students who stated they would have their GED in one year were at the 0 to 3 grade reading level. Apparently the GED is thought to be an academic objective by many students who are prepared to say that they see no realistic hope of achieving this objective in the near future. Obviously there are some students who have unrealistic expectations regarding the attainment of this objective. The pattern of responses between schools is comparable and does not show any special phenomena at work in the experimental school.

A sample of student responses from both schools is included to give a sense of the tone of the responses to this question regarding time required to attain the GED:

> "I hope two years and if I am lucky in one year."
> "I really don't know yet."
> "Couple of months."
> "Seems forever here to me."
> "I hope soon."
> "I don't know but I want to get out."
> "Life time."
> "Next year (Maybe never if I don't get proper teaching)."
> "I have my GED."
> "Years because the teachers don't work hard."
> "I don't think that I will."
> "Fourteen more weeks."
> "I don't think I will get it, taking me too long as it is."

---

[1] These data are reported in Table VIII, page 36.

TABLE VI

PERCEPTIONS OF STUDENTS, CPS, CCDPA, AND WIN PERSONNEL ON STUDENTS' REASONS FOR ATTENDING SCHOOL AND STUDENTS' OWN REASONS FOR ATTENDING SCHOOL[1]

(Reported by Percentage)

	PRE-TEST					POST-TEST				
	Perceptions of				Students' Stated Reasons	Perceptions of				Students' Stated Reasons
	CPS	CCDPA	WIN	Students		CPS	CCDPA	WIN	Students	
To get a job	D 50	30	25	54	83	46	29	28	67	80
	M 35	100		68	85	42	0		67	92
Help children with homework	D 38	0	4	40	69	31	0	0	47	63
	M 12	40		21	61	17	0		50	75
To be better person	D 56	50	23	61	82	54	29	21	63	80
	M 41	100		59	83	42	100		58	75
To please family	D 19	0	2	27	34	15	0	0	23	33
	M 6	0		33	39	0	0		33	42
To get out of house	D 0	0	4	22	17	0	0	0	13	13
	M 6	0		15	7	17	0		17	92
To get more money	D 13	30	40	27	23	23	57	14	27	7
	M 59	80		34	22	42	33		25	33
To get better job	D 44	60	32	65	83	39	29	21	50	83
	M 35	100		79	85	33	100		58	75
To get GED	D 44	50	14	58	19	54	29	14	43	80
	M 53	50		79	20	58	100		75	92
To have friends	D 13	20	0	14	82	0	0	0	20	30
	M 12	0		16	89	8	0		17	33
To really learn	D 50	40	29	68	95	54	29	28	60	87
	M 24	89		66	87	33	67		83	92
Forced to	D 13	10	16	21	6	0	14	10	20	3
	M 6	20		7	4	17	0		33	17

---

[1] Each person was asked to rate the reasons in terms of whether in their perception a few, about half, most or almost all students came for that particular reason. In this table the "most" and "almost all" categories have been combined and reported.

During the conference there was heated discussion regarding the pre-vocational portion of the curriculum. Further, there was confusion within and among the four groups over the question of whether the shops at Doolittle were intended to be pre-vocational or vocational. Some felt that shops should be increased and made effective vocationally with more realistic job training, while others saw shops as a means of decreasing boredom and providing a change from the academic program. The students felt that no students should be required to take shops but those students who elected to do so should be allowed to take the shops for enough time to develop real skill.

The chief administrators from all three agencies had no difficulty in agreeing that the primary offical objective of the Doolittle program is to increase the students' employability.

WIN representatives would like a more clear-cut curriculum for those students who had the potential for obtaining jobs. Further there was some feeling that participation in the shops was impeding the progress of students who were working toward obtaining the GED certificate.

Although this lack of consensus on objectives was listed as a high priority problem by conferees and the confusion regarding objectives was documented among all agency personnel throughout the project, the administrators who met as a group on May 22 agreed on the purpose of the Doolittle program and their conclusion was that preparation for employment is primary. Nevertheless, the identification of the official primary purpose did not suffice to persuade the agency personnel of the purpose of the program.

A sample of the purposes identified by professional personnel of the three agencies is shown below:

CPS: "To prepare students for a more meaningful life."
"To develop the educational potential of the student. To give him a spirit of dignity and independence."
"To prepare students for jobs."
"I would like that defined for me by the administration also."
"I regret I do not know. Discussions and answers to this question would do much to organize and improve our program."

CCDPA: "To prepare students to qualify for employment."
"For students to obtain their GED and brush up on their general education."
"Right now, no clear-cut purpose. Theoretically it is supposed to prepare recipients for employment."

WIN: "To prepare persons to become vocationally marketable and at the same time be genuine persons in a democratic society."
"Hard to tell."
"To help people get off the welfare rolls."
"To enable a person to think for himself and become more independent and self-supporting."

In conclusion, with regard to public information or information available to the project team, there has been no effective change regarding the clarification of objectives. On the other hand, among participants of the Doolittle project there is evidence that marked differences of opinion regarding objectives exist. Further, apparently no mechanism now exists to match students to a curriculum and counseling specific to their particular educational objectives. Given the characteristics of the students referred to Doolittle, the employment situation, and the philosophical outlook of the professional personnel of the three agencies, it may well be virtually impossible to arrive at unanimous agreement on the purposes of the program.

Problem 3

The curriculum appears to be inflexible and not designed to serve each individual's educational needs.

Solution 1. Adequate entry counseling should be provided. Except for the report by CCDPA personnel that they are placing increased emphasis on the voluntary nature of the program, no other changes have been reported in this area.

Solution 2. The curriculum should be more flexible with departmentalization and electives. The Doolittle curriculum has undergone the following changes: the electric and wood shops have been eliminated; another typing shop has been added; typing I and II are now offered; and the sewing shop has been redesigned into a homemaking shop with tailoring for men. GED students do not have the option of shops. Level I ABE students may elect the homemaking shop. The GED program is departmentalized and teaching teams allow for specializing for Level II students. A tutorial period is available for Level II and Level III ABE students.

Solution 3. Students should be allowed to change classrooms as in a conventional high school and a graduation ceremony should be held. The present system allows for some change of classrooms for all students although not exactly as proposed by the conferees.

A graduation ceremony was reinstituted in June with extensive student participation. The Student Council planned and implemented the ceremony and the homemaking class served canapés and frappé at the reception. Graduating students decorated the auditorium. Although primary emphasis was placed on the awarding of the GED certificates, students with particularly good attendance records were also recognized.

Solution 4. Students preparing for the GED should be given help in particular areas needed. The departmentalization of the GED and the establishment of the tutoring period is an effort to serve these needs.

Solution 5. Shops and courses should be elective. All shops are now elective for students in the ABE program. Students in the GED program do not take shops. Efforts have been reported to individualize instruction in the academic courses, but these courses are not offered on an elective basis.

Solution 6. More courses and pre-vocational shops should be offered. More options are being offered in the typing and homemaking shops; otherwise the shops have been reduced. Perhaps the purpose served by the shops has been reconsidered as well, although no data were collected on such reconsideration.

Solution 7. There should be a reassessment of the supply of textbooks and supplies. A complete inventory of books was made by Mr. Grimes. A new ABE curriculum guide prepared by the CPS which was in preparation prior to the project is now available. For the first time at Doolittle all teachers were invited to participate in the selection of texts. To help them, the principal organized a display of materials available and one in-service meeting was held on selection of texts. Based on observations made by the project team in a number of classrooms, students appear to have both a larger supply of books, and a number of different texts as well as supplementary material. Some needs still remain in this area, however, but orders have been placed and arrangements have been made to meet them.

Solution 8. Pre-vocational shops should be evaluated by an outside group. No action was taken.

Solution 9. Student progress should be reviewed with attention to students who appear to have reached their academic potential. No action noted.

Solution 10. The curriculum should be expanded, e.g., art and music should be added. No action. Group sessions were reinstituted by the CCDPA group worker on topics such as consumer education. The departure of the group worker has ended the group sessions.

Solution 11. Special tutorial help should be provided. A tutorial period has been instituted. From the observations of the project staff some teachers need assistance in understanding how to initiate specialized help to individual students.

Solution 12. Students should be made aware of potential benefits of shops. No action detected.

Problem 4

Students report that monies received for clothing, babysitting and lunches are inadequate. Checks arrive late and irregularly.

Solution. Representatives from all three agencies should meet, resolve issues regarding finances and see to it that all students are treated equitably.

The complaints by the students were of two kinds: (1) not enough money was allotted for clothing, lunches and babysitting, and (2) the funds were being distributed inequitably. Mr. Wilhelm, the CCDPA Supervisor at Doolittle, has made a special effort to expedite the receipt of emergency allowances by having requests hand-delivered to the central agency department and having them returned directly to the school where they are promptly distributed. Carfare and lunch money for most Doolittle students is now included in their regular checks to prevent delay in receiving these monies.

In terms of the inequitable distribution of allowances, most of the complaints in this area were directed by students towards the Supervising Case Worker who resigned December 1. Mr. Brown, the new Supervising Case Worker, has made a simplified list of allowances available to all students. Case workers report that Mr. Brown has been very helpful in helping them work out difficult problems relating to assignment of allotments.

Problem 5

Some teaching methods, attitudes and rapport need improvement.

The questionnaire data provided some information on this statement. Students were asked to rate personnel from the three agencies in terms of a scale of Terrible, Bad, Good and Very Good (See Table VII). Because of the differences between the numbers of students who responded to the pre-test and those who responded to the post-test all inferences from the data must be drawn with caution.

TABLE VII

STUDENTS' EVALUATION OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL[1]
(Reported by Percentage)

(Students responding: Pre - Doolittle 64, Midwest 45;
Post - Doolittle 30, Midwest 12)

		PRE-TEST		POST-TEST	
		Terrible and Bad	Good and Very Good	Terrible and Bad	Good and Very Good
Shop Teacher					
Knows subject	D	6	70	3	53
	M	2	87	0	83
Helps student understand	D	10	75	0	80
	M	0	90	0	83
Makes students feel easy	D	11	72	3	73
	M	2	88	8	75
Gets students through system	D	14	66	7	73
	M	0	98	0	83
Classroom Teacher					
Knows subject	D	5	94	3	90
	M	0	96	8	83
Helps student understand	D	13	87	0	93
	M	0	93	8	83
Makes students feel easy	D	11	83	7	83
	M	0	84	8	83
Gets students through system	D	14	78	3	87
	M	0	94	8	83
Caseworker					
Really knows facts	D	12	76	17	77
	M	11	76	25	50
Can get client what's in book	D	15	70	10	77
	M	15	74	8	67
Tries to get client all allowed	D	11	74	20	60
	M	20	72	25	58
Treats me like I'm somebody	D	10	82	7	83
	M	8	88	17	67
WIN Worker					
Really knows his stuff	D	6	29	0	40
	M	2	50	8	50
Can get client into job or program	D	6	27	3	30
	M	2	50	8	83
Really works for client	D	8	27	7	37
	M	4	48	8	50
Treats me like I'm somebody	D	6	31	3	53
	M	4	41	25	67

---

[1] These numbers do not add up to 100% since some students did not answer the question. This is especially true for the WIN data; only 50% of all students were able to name a WIN worker on the pre-test, therefore "I don't know" and "no answer" accounts for the low percentage figures (37 to 62% of the answers fell in this category in the pre-test).

No major differences were reflected in the way students at Midwest and Doolittle rated their shop teachers overall. In the cases of CPS personnel, CCDPA and WIN staff, Doolittle students rated these three groups Bad or Terrible less often than students at Midwest on the post-test. The reverse of this was true on the pre-test. In general, the students at Doolittle made more favorable evaluations of professionals at the end of the project than did Midwest students. Professional staff were also asked to rate teaching staff on their abilities and attitudes and these data are shown in Table VIII.

Several points stand out in the data presented in Table VIII.

(1) All professionals tended to agree that students take adult responsibility in the program, but with the exception of the WIN respondents the strength of this conviction decreased at both Centers during the time the project was in operation.

(2) Professional personnel became less certain that white staff are unable to understand the problems of their black clientele.

(3) In general, the professional personnel increased in their agreement with the judgment that the personnel of each agency are dedicated.

(4) At the end of the project personnel of both CPS and CCDPA were less inclined to agree with the statement that every teacher had the responsibility to learn about WIN than had been the case at the beginning.

(5) Representatives of WIN and CCDPA did not feel any more inclined to agree with the statement that WIN and CCDPA personnel should initiate discussions with teachers on student problems at the end of the project than they showed at the beginning.

(6) CCDPA and CPS representatives were less inclined to feel that students should finish their GED training even if they could get a job and get off welfare at the end of the project than they were at the beginning. The opposite trend was noted for the WIN representatives who completed the questionnaires.

(7) Although WIN representatives, who might justifiably have been most goal-oriented, reported no strong feeling on whether attendance should be optional, both CCDPA and CPS disagreed with the statement more strongly at the end of the project than they did at the beginning.

(8) The perception of professional personnel in all three agencies both at the beginning and end of the project is that it is the responsibility of the administrators to insure inter-agency cooperation for the benefit of the students. It should

TABLE VIII

PROFESSIONAL STAFF ATTITUDES REPORTED BY GROUP MEAN ON A SEVEN POINT SCALE

1 3.5 7
Disagree Neutral Agree

		PRE-TEST			POST-TEST		
		Teachers	Public Aid	WIN	Teachers	Public Aid	WIN
	D M	N=16 N=17	N=10 N=5	N=50	N=13 N=12	N=7 N=3	N=29
Students take adult responsibility	D M	5.6 5.7	5.6 6.2	4.5	5.5 4.0	4.7 5.3	4.8
White staff unable to understand problems of black clientele	D M	3.9 3.2	3.8 4.6	4.3	2.9 3.8	2.6 1.3	4.6
Teaching staff are dedicated	D M	5.2 4.9	2.4 5.2	3.2	5.7 4.3	2.6 5.3	3.8
Public Aid staff are dedicated	D M	4.4 4.1	3.3 6.0	3.0	4.7 4.2	3.1 6.7	3.8
WIN staff are dedicated	D M	4.0 3.1	2.9 3.2	3.4	3.8 3.5	2.9 4.7	4.3
Teachers should initiate discussion with case workers on student problems	D M	2.8 4.8	6.3 5.8	5.2	4.7 4.7	6.3 6.3	5.4
Responsibility of every teacher to learn about WIN	D M	5.4 5.8	5.8 5.6	5.3	5.0 4.5	4.7 4.3	5.3
Public Aid & WIN should initiate discussion with teachers on student problems	D M	5.3 5.3	5.8 6.6	6.0	5.3 4.1	5.0 6.7	5.7
Student attendance should be optional	D M	5.0 4.0	2.9 2.6	3.1	3.2 3.0	1.4 1.0	3.7
Students encouraged to take responsibility to develop own educational programs	D M	5.5 5.2	3.9 5.6	5.1	4.2 5.5	4.6 6.7	5.8
Student should finish GED even if he can go to work & get off welfare	D M	5.9 5.1	5.8 6.6	4.0	5.3 5.0	4.9 5.7	5.1
Admin. job within 3 agencies to insure coop. for benefit of students	D M	7.0 6.1	7.0 6.4	6.5	6.7 6.5	6.4 6.3	6.5
Assignment of student by grade reading level is best way	D M	6.1 4.6	4.7 5.6	4.9	6.2 5.6	6.4 5.0	4.7
The way staff behaves is not way staff feels about students	D M	2.8 2.6	4.0 4.5	4.7	4.2 4.1	4.0 4.7	4.4
Center's schedule is too rigid	D M	2.5 2.9	2.4 2.6	3.8	2.3 1.9	1.1 1.7	4.2

be noted, however, that the Doolittle personnel were less in agreement with the statement at the end of the project than they were at the beginning, while Midwest personnel tended to be more in agreement at the end of the project than they were at the beginning.

(9) Both CCDPA and CPS representatives were more willing to accept the notion that the Center's schedule is too rigid at the end of the project than they were at the beginning.

(10) The table does not reflect any systematic difference between the responses of the Doolittle personnel and the Midwest personnel during the project. The only difference noted, and it is not a marked one, is in response to the statement identifying inter-agency coordination as the responsibility of agency administrators.

As a means of assessing the extent to which individuals in each of the agencies perceived the effectiveness of other professionals in their own and other agencies, questionnaires were administered to personnel in all three agencies. The responses are shown in Table IX.

In contrast to the responses of personnel at Midwest, the CCDPA and CPS professionals at Doolittle almost without exception gave higher ratings to members of their own and other agencies at the end of the project than they had given at the beginning.

Ratings by the WIN personnel for CCDPA and their WIN colleagues improved somewhat during the time the project was in operation. Their ratings of CPS personnel and of administrators were all lower at the end of the project than they had been at the beginning, indicating that increased familiarity and increased communication led to less favorable ratings. These differences are of sufficient magnitude to deserve attention, but the reason for these changes which are in contrast to the prevailing trend is unclear.

Solutions suggested by the project personnel were:

Solution 1. A study of teacher attitudes and student evaluation plan. No action.

The project staff noted that teachers and students worked well together in implementing the graduation ceremony, the school picnic, and a going away party for a teacher. Students interviewed on the field visits reported a marked change in many teachers' approach to them in explaining homework and assisting them on specific problems. The Student Council was permitted to choose a teacher as an advisor and its members report a very positive rapport in this situation. Information from student decisions in Student Council meetings is reported back to the teachers through their advisor, the students indicate.

TABLE IX

RATINGS OF EACH GROUP OF PROFESSIONALS BY GROUP REPORTED BY GROUP MEAN SCORE

1 = Good 2 = Fair 3 = Poor
D = Doolittle Center; M = Midwest Center

Dimensions of Groups being Rated		PRE-TEST			POST-TEST		
		Ratings by			Ratings by		
		Teachers	Public Aid	WIN	Teachers	Public Aid	WIN
	D	N=16	N=10		N=13	N=7	
	M	N=17	N=5	N=50	N=12	N=3	N=29
Public Aid Personnel are rated in:							
Effectiveness in role	D	1.9	2.0	2.2	1.5	2.0	2.1
	M	2.4	1.4		1.9	1.0	
Cooperation with other agencies	D	2.1	2.0	2.2	1.5	1.9	2.0
	M	2.0	1.8		2.2	1.3	
Relation to students	D	2.1	1.3	2.3	1.6	1.6	2.0
	M	1.8	1.2		1.7	1.3	
WIN Personnel are rated in:							
Effectiveness in role	D	2.5	2.3	1.7	1.9	2.0	1.7
	M	2.8	2.6		2.6	2.0	
Cooperation with other agencies	D	2.5	2.6	1.7	2.3	2.1	1.7
	M	2.6	2.6		2.8	2.6	
Relation to students	D	2.3	2.1	1.6	2.1	2.0	1.5
	M	2.3	2.6		2.6	2.3	
Teachers are rated in:							
Competence in subject	D	1.3	2.8	1.9	1.3	1.9	2.5
	M	1.9	2.4		1.4	1.3	
Ability in class	D	1.4	3.0	2.0	1.2	2.0	2.6
	M	1.4	3.0		1.5	1.6	
Relation to students	D	1.4	2.7	2.0	1.2	1.9	2.6
	M	1.3	3.0		1.5	1.3	
Administrators being rated:							
Principal	D	1.1	1.9	1.9	1.0	1.7	2.6
	M	1.2	2.6		1.7	1.3	
District office supervisor	D	1.2	2.2	1.8	1.0	1.7	2.6
	M	1.8	2.6		1.9	1.0	
WIN office supervisor	D	1.0	2.0	1.7	1.5	2.0	1.9
	M	2.1	2.3		2.3	2.0	

Problem 6

Counseling service to students could be more effective.

Solution 1. Counselors from all three agencies should meet and coordinate their counseling services. No action was reported on this specific proposal. The WIN Task Force attempted to get at this problem by interviewing all Doolittle students in the WIN program and then discussing each case with the Vocational Counseling staff of CCDPA. This discussion was not extensive and tended to be more of an exchange of information but was a start in a coordination of counseling services. Mrs. Montgomery, the Adjustment Teacher, reports that prior to Mr. Murphy's coming she knew nothing about WIN. Since January she has begun receiving a number of inquiries regarding students from the WIN program. The WIN Task Force also took the opportunity to talk with Mrs. Montgomery. Prior to the project WIN personnel at the conference and the WIN Task Force leader reported that they did not know that CPS maintained a person responsible for counseling.

Solution 2. The case work staff should be increased. No action observed. Evidence regarding the weighted case loads of CCDPA personnel from the central office indicates that in May the Midwest caseload was 1,502, Doolittle case load was 1,794, and Hilliard case load was 333. It is also true that a case worker actually working at another center is officially reported as being at Doolittle. It was apparent to the project staff that the pressures on the CCDPA staff were great. The supervisor was required to give direct counseling to clients; the group worker had been requested in the early fall to drop all group work activities to enroll students in WIN; and the Vocational Counselors spent much of their time giving out lunch and carfare money, which prevented them from accomplishing counseling goals. During the project the number of CCDPA personnel at Doolittle actually declined.

Further the geographical isolation of the CCDPA unit (along with the Child Development Unit) in another part of the building did not encourage informal communication across case worker-teacher lines.

Another factor in the problem of too-heavy case loads is the speed with which cases are transferred to and from the school. Central office personnel contend that very few cases are not transferred promptly while conferees contend that almost one-third of their cases were awaiting reassignment.

In addition, the open enrollment policy while apparently desirable for students and the program, and which resulted in increased enrollment, placed severe strains on the CCDPA staff. There was little evidence of very low morale among the staff who had little formal in-service training for their job, and were experiencing mounting pressures from WIN: the impending transfer of Vocational Rehabilitation to the Labor Department and an increase in the student enrollment by some 100 cases.

Solution 3. Each student should be adequately counseled on entry. No action reported.

Solution 4. A referral form between CCDPA and teachers should be developed. Action on this proposal was considered inadvisable by administrators.

Solution 5. Teachers should make a special effort to inform students on their progress. Students reported a general increase in teacher feedback on their progress although no formal procedures have been developed for this.

Solution 6. Students should take initiative in making use of counseling resources. No action was noted although the utilization of the Student Council to move toward this goal was hampered for several months by the resignation of the Coordinator who previously had taken the responsibility for calling meetings. Under the guidance of the current advisor to the Student Council there are indications that the Council will be playing a more active role and will be encouraging students in general to do so as well.

Problem 7

Students experience difficulty in receiving checks from WIN.

Solution 1. A WIN worker should be stationed at Doolittle full-time or at least two to three days a week. On July 1, Mr. White made arrangements for stationing WIN personnel at Doolittle two to three days a week, as previously reported.

Solution 2. The WIN Liaison's schedule should be posted. The WIN Liaison's schedule was made available to the CPS and CCDPA staff by the WIN task force. The WIN Liaison visits to Doolittle have followed much the same pattern as previous to the project in terms of visiting administrative personnel. No one reported increased qualitative interaction with the WIN Liaison. The new principal had not been instructed on the WIN program in his orientation and did not have the WIN phone number nor had he met the WIN Liaison by the time of the May 22 meeting.

Solution 3. WIN paycards for absent students should be left with CCDPA personnel so that students would not have the problem of late checks or have to make a trip downtown to sign their cards. Mr. Wilhelm stated his willingness to receive pay cards for absent students until WIN personnel were stationed at the Center, who would then assume this responsibility.

Solution 4. Arrangements should be made by WIN and Doolittle administrators to have WIN checks delivered to the school. This solution, according to WIN administrators, was not feasible; however, when the WIN representatives are stationed at the school, checks can probably be distributed by these persons directly to the student.

This concludes the listing of problems, proposed solutions, and actions taken as reported by participants. In conclusion it is apparent that diverse individuals representing various agencies can come to a consensus on problem identification and that in a period of five months they can implement some solutions.

Broadly speaking, the problems identified by the conferees relating to the actual operations of the present system can be identified as communications, objectives, curriculum, financial arrangements, teaching methods, competency, attitudes, and counseling. Some progress has been made in terms of communication but there is much to be done to counter the effects of the massive size and highly regulatory character of the agencies involved. Very little progress was made in the clarification of objectives. Some progress was made, within the many legal restrictions regarding financing, in taking care of the inequities in allottments and delivery of monies to the students. A start was made on in-service programs among teachers but no systematic provisions have been made for these programs and little if any progress was made in CCDPA or WIN. Attitudes among groups have improved in some cases and have become more entrenched in other cases although, on the balance, students seem to feel that professionals' attitudes toward them are improved. Counseling services, except in the case of the efforts of the WIN Task Force, have evidently not undergone much change.

Perceptions of Participants Following Project

What about the personnel at Doolittle following the project? How did they perceive the project on its formal completion and are there other effects which are not taken into account by merely looking at problem lists, proposed solutions, and reported actions? All personnel at Doolittle and the conferees were asked to respond to questions regarding their perceptions of the project, changes brought about by the project, and strengths and weaknesses they saw in the project procedures. These data will now be discussed.

WIN personnel were asked to respond to the question, "What in your opinion was the purpose of the Doolittle Project?" since the conferees from this agency represented only a small portion of WIN personnel who had student clients at Doolittle.

Of the 29 WIN respondents, 20 answered the question in some manner, and 9 left it blank. Of the 20 persons responding two stated they did not know the purpose of the project; four respondents clearly by their answers had confused the Doolittle project with the Doolittle Center; three answered in general terms of "evaluation of basic education"; one answer made no sense; and ten persons apparently knew about the project and were able to state its general purpose correctly. It had been the growing impression of the project staff that communication within the WIN agency often was uneven and that the mechanism of the team members' meeting to communicate with each other regularly about their clients was not always effective. From the data it appeared that only one-third of the WIN respondents (N=29) were able to describe generally the Doolittle project. Even then the response, "to gather information and statistics which will be ignored" reflects an attitude of cynicism which must either have a basis in a high level of frustration or indicates incomplete information regarding the assumptions underlying the project.

Some responses to this question indicated little knowledge of the Task Force, such as "I have no idea" and "unknown to me and I was a part of the Doolittle Project." Others responded with comments such as: "to gain information about the progress of our clients," "students who aren't progressing having been there for x years show no motivation, would be terminated," "to help determine if Doolittle Basic Education should be used by WIN." Nine persons of the 29 respondents were able to state in some manner the purpose of the WIN Task Force relative to the Doolittle Project.

Eighty-three per cent of those responding to the post-test questionnaire from WIN stated that their team had from 1 to 15 enrollees studying at Doolittle. Eighty-three per cent of the respondents reported having a team case load of over 200 clients with 55 per cent of the above being on a team having 228 to 300 clients.

These data indicate the immensity of the problem of increasing communications about a specific location within an agency where personnel have a high case load, and those clients may be in training in any one of 23 locations. At the same time, WIN is an agency which is growing rapidly and is pre-occupied with a great deal of internal change.

Doolittle students were also asked to respond to the question, "What was the purpose of the Doolittle Project?" Thirty per cent of the 30 respondents stated that they did not know the purpose of the project, 17 per cent left the answer blank, and 53 per cent responded to the question but at varying levels of understanding. Twenty-three per cent of the responses indicated that the student understood the general purpose of the project; fifty per cent of the 30 student respondents said that a member of the Student Council had discussed the project with them.

These data seem to indicate that the mechanisms for getting information to a large student body through a representative body of students requires a student committee which clearly understands its function and is organized to communicate information to its constituency.

All persons taking the questionnaire were asked to indicate the most important changes that have been made at their school during the year. Table X illustrates the quantity of the responses while Table XI contains a qualitative analysis of the responses by grouping them into three categories. (Table XI also contains information regarding desired changes.)

TABLE X

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS AND PROFESSIONALS NOT PERCEIVING CHANGES IN THEIR SCHOOLS
(Reported by Percentage)

Responses		Students	CPS	CCDPA	WIN
No response, can't think of any, not applicable	D	23	23	14	41
	M	42	33	0	

Ignoring the three responses of the Midwest CCDPA, more Doolittle personnel perceived changes occurring in their school than Midwest personnel. On the other hand WIN personnel, who are seldom at the school and whose communication with school personnel has been shown to be minimal, understandably have the largest number of persons who were unaware of or unwilling to enumerate observed changes.

In Table XI, which shows the categories of changes perceived by those responding to the question, some interesting differences can be noted. Students in both schools saw most changes occurring around curriculum, academic policies, and teaching method. Students in both schools also saw changes in the rules, physical facilities, and services with Doolittle student responses being over twice as numerous. Three per cent of the Doolittle students noted changes which demonstrated a concern for the student (client). The number of Doolittle CPS personnel responses was only slightly higher than that of Midwest CPS personnel but Doolittle CPS personnel indicated almost twice as many changes relating to the concern for the student than did Midwest teachers. Of all four groups, Doolittle CCDPA personnel registered the highest relative number of responses and unlike Midwest CCDPA saw changes in all three categories of response. The WIN personnel had the lowest average response rate (13%) and the changes they reported fell almost entirely into the academic orientation category.

TABLE XI

STUDENTS' AND PROFESSIONALS' PERCEPTIONS OF CHANGES MADE AND DESIRED AT THEIR SCHOOLS
(Reported by Percentage)

CHANGES		STUDENTS			CPS			CCDPA			WIN		
		Student Orientation[1]	Academic Orientation[2]	Mechanical[3]	Student Orientation	Academic Orientation	Mechanical	Client-Orientation	Academic Orientation	Mechanical	Client-Orientation	Academic Orientation	Mechanical
Changes Made:													
1st change listed	D	0	50	23	39	15	23	14	57	14	0	38	0
	M	0	50	8	17	33	17	0	100	0			
2nd change listed	D	3	17	20	15	23	15	43	14	29	3	0	0
	M	0	0	17	8	8	17	0	67	0			
3rd change listed	D	3	0	7	8	0	8	14	29	0	0	0	0
	M	0	0	0	8	8	17	0	67	0			
Average Response	D	3	22	17	20	13	15	24	33	14	1	13	0
	M	0	17	8	11	17	17	0	48	0			
Changes Desired:													
1st change listed	D	3	37	20	8	39	0	0	14	43	0	17	38
	M	0	17	50	8	15	23	0	57	0			
2nd change listed	D	0	10	43	8	15	23	0	57	0	0	14	17
	M	0	25	17	0	25	33	0	33	67			
3rd change listed	D	0	10	30	15	15	0	14	0	14	7	10	7
	M	0	17	25	8	8	25	0	33	67			
Average Response	D	1	19	31	10	23	8	5	24	19	2	14	21
	M	0	20	30	3	33	22	22	22	56			

[1] Student orientation = responses which demonstrated a concern for the student (or client).

[2] Academic orientation = responses which related to changes in curriculum, academic policy, and teaching method, and sometimes to administrative structure.

[3] Mechanical = responses relating to rules, physical facilities and services.

All respondents were then asked to list three changes they desired to have made within their program. In this area the Midwest groups made more suggestions than did their Doolittle counterparts. Doolittle CPS personnel showed more concern with desired changes which were student-oriented than Midwest CPS personnel. The reverse was true of Midwest CPS personnel's concern for changes relating to physical facilities (mechanics). Again WIN had the lowest response rate of the four groups with most of the changes desired falling into academic orientation or mechanics.

These data could be interpreted in at least two ways which are antithetical to each other. On the one hand, one could say that Midwest personnel are more open to change and reflect this openness in listing numerous changes which could be made. On the other hand it is possible that Doolittle personnel have experienced some alleviation of their frustration regarding problem areas; having acquired a more sophisticated and realistic understanding of the problem, their expectations for change have become more modest. Whatever the case there is certainly evidence to show that both the Midwest and Doolittle personnel and students desire a large number of changes. Whether that desire for change can be channeled into a constructive modification of the existing situation and energies can be released to make those changes is an interesting question. The WIN personnel's inability to perceive many of the changes within the Doolittle school and their lesser ability or unwillingness to specify desired changes may probably be attributed to lack of firsthand knowledge of Doolittle because of the fact that only a small proportion of the WIN personnel had ever been to Doolittle.

Respondents were also asked who was responsible for the perceived changes which they had listed and who has the authority to make the desired changes which they had listed as well. These data are shown in Tables XII, XIII, and XIV.

Students from Doolittle saw seven categories of persons making the changes in their school (Table XII) while Midwest students saw the "principal" as responsible for most changes with the "Student Council" or "both principal and Student Council" responsible for their perceived changes. On the other hand, professional personnel at Doolittle tended to see simpler approaches to initiating change which centered around administration, usually the principal (Table XIII) while Midwest CPS personnel saw the process as a much more complex interaction involving many persons in the school. WIN made no effort to identify the person or groups responsible for the change.

TABLE XII

STUDENTS' PERCEPTION OF WHO WAS RESPONSIBLE FOR CHANGES MADE[1] (Reported by Percentage)

	Principal	Student Council	Both	Teachers	Case Workers	WIN	"Authorities
Doolittle	23	23	3	7	3	3	10
Midwest	42	8	8	0	0	0	0

[1] First change only was used in reporting, since n for Midwest was too small on the second and third changes.

TABLE XIII

PROFESSIONALS' PERCEPTION OF WHO WAS RESPONSIBLE FOR CHANGES MADE (Reported by percentages for two types of responses)

		CPS		CCDPA		WIN	
		"Principal"	"Everyone"	"Principal"	"Everyone"	"Principal"	"Everyone"
First change listed	D	46	0	29	0	0	0
	M	17	8	0	0		
Second change listed	D	23	0	29	0	0	0
	M	0	8	0			
Third change listed	D	8	0	0	0	0	0
	M	0	8	0	67		
Average	D	26	0	20	0		
	M	5	8	insufficient	N		

In assessing who had the authority to make changes desired in the school, no differences are apparent between Doolittle and Midwest students (the principal has the authority). While Doolittle and Midwest professional personnel tended to be more alike in assigning authority within the school, Midwest CPS personnel tended to define authority within the school as interacting with authority outside the local situation (external agents). Doolittle CCDPA personnel assigned only authority to the principal in terms of desired changes; on the other hand, Midwest CCDPA personnel (N=3) assigned the authority to all persons within the school. WIN responses on this question were too few to report. (See Table XIV.)

TABLE XIV

STUDENTS' AND PROFESSIONALS' PERCEPTIONS OF WHO HAS AUTHORITY TO MAKE CHANGES DESIRED IN THEIR SCHOOLS

(Reported by Percentage)

		Principal	Students	Cooperative Effort	External Authority
Students					
First change desired	D	37	0	3	0
	M	58	0	0	0
Second change desired	D	17	7	3	0
	M	8	0	0	0
Third change desired	D	13	7	0	0
	M	17	0	0	0
Average Response	D	23	2	1	0
	M	27	2	1	0
CPS					
First change desired	D	15	0	8	0
	M	8	0	0	17
Second change desired	D	8	0	8	0
	M	8	0	0	8
Third change desired	D	0	0	16	0
	M	8	0	0	8
Average Response	D	8	0	10	0
	M	8	0	0	11
CCDPA					
First change desired	D	0	0	0	0
	M	0	0	0	0
Second change desired	D	14	0	0	0
	M	0	0	0	0
Third change desired	D	14	0	0	0
	M	0	0	33	0
Average Response	D	10	0	11	0
	M	0	0	0	0

These data show a tendency for Doolittle students to see the principal as an agent of change rather than seeing the many persons they felt were responsible for making past changes as being involved in the making of future changes. Doolittle CPS personnel continue to see themselves and others in the school as having the authority to make changes along with the principal; Midwest CPS personnel continue to assign the authority to the principal in both perceived and desired changes but in the case of desired changes they see external authorities, such as state director of Adult Basic Education and the Superintendent of Schools, as sharing this responsibility.

Finally, conferees were asked to report their perceptions of the successes and failures of the Doolittle project. These data are reported in Tables XV and XVI. Improved communications received one of the largest number of nominations for success but the continued lack of communications received the most votes for the greatest failure of the project. Students especially seem to feel that communications are still a problem. The increased number of books and curriculum changes were seen, especially by students, as major successes of the project. The opportunity for meeting face to face and working with other agency personnel and improved interpersonal relations received a large number of nominations as a successful outcome of the project. Several of the failures listed relate to a lack of follow-through by personnel or administrators within agencies or by a specific agency in which personnel felt no changes occurred. Two WIN representatives agree with a number of the project staff that the greatest failure of the project was a lack of assigning specific responsibility for proposed changes.

Chapter IV has provided the quantitative and qualitative data obtained from the Doolittle professional personnel and students regarding their perceptions of the successes and failures of the project. In the following chapter a comparable assessment is given from the perspective of the adult education graduate students and the project director.

TABLE XV

CONFEREES' PERCEPTION OF THE MAJOR SUCCESS
OF THE DOOLITTLE PROJECT
(Reported by number of responses
within groups)

Perceived Successes of the Doolittle Project	CCDPA (N=6)	CPS (N=8)	Students (N=10)	WIN (N=9)	Total (N=33)
1. Improved Communications between agencies	2	4	0	3	9
2. More books & materials	2	2	5	1	10
3. More flexible curriculum	1	1	5	2	9
4. Improved inter-personal relations	1	3	1	0	5
5. Opportunity to meet & work with other agency personnel	1	1	0	3	5
6. The WIN Task Force	0	0	0	2	2
7. Open enrollment	1	1	1	0	3
8. More objective & open to criticism	0	2	0	0	2
9. Understanding of different views of objectives	0	0	0	1	1
10. Opportunity to really help the student	0	1	0	0	1
12. The change in administrators	0	1	0	0	1
13. A clearer understanding of problems	0	2	0	0	2
14. Teacher In-service	0	1	0	0	1
15. Some positive solutions	0	2	0	0	2
16. No answer	1	0	3	0	4

TABLE XVI

CONFEREES' PERCEPTIONS OF THE MAJOR FAILURES OF THE DOOLITTLE PROJECT

(Reported by number of responses within groups)

Perceived Failures of Doolittle Project	CCDPA (N=6)	CPS (N=8)	Students (N=10)	WIN (N=9)	Total (N=33)
1. Continued lack of communication between agencies	0	1	4	3	8
2. Lack of follow-through within agencies	1	0	0	2	3
3. Lack of assigning responsibility for changes	0	0	0	2	2
4. Public Aid didn't make any changes	2	0	0	0	2
5. Change in administration prevented implementation of change	0	1	0	0	1
6. No CCDPA In-service	1	0	0	0	1
7. Conference won't occur again	1	0	0	0	1
8. Administrators won't acknowledge need for change	0	1	0	0	1
9. Elimination of shops	0	1	0	0	1
10. Administrators didn't meet	1	0	0	0	1
11. Don't know	1	0	0	2	3
12. No answer	1	1	4	0	6

CHAPTER V

PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION AND SOLUTION: PERSPECTIVES OF THE PROJECT STAFF

As the project was conceived it was felt by the staff that a comprehensive assessment of the effectiveness of the approach could not be made if only the perspectives of the persons closely associated with the Center were considered. While it was recognized that the problems and the solutions which the professionals and students would identify would be the ones of greatest immediate concern to them, it seemed essential also to arrange for independent problem assessment, data collection, and activity monitoring by individuals outside the Doolittle system. Accordingly the project staff developed their own ideas concerning the conditions limiting the effectiveness and efficiency of the system, devised questionnaires and other data collection procedures, and attempted to assess changes in these dimensions as well as in those conditions identified through the collective efforts of the persons within the Doolittle Family Education Center system. In this chapter problems identified by the project staff, the data they collected regarding these problems, and the interpretation of the data are presented.

Perception of the Communications Problem

One of the assumptions which formed the basis for this experimental in-service training project was that those who work at the operational level of a system are best able to identify the operational-level problems in that system. The result of the meetings and the supporting research carried out by the University of Chicago have demonstrated the soundness of that belief. Contrary to the view of those who might believe that the professional staffs of the various agencies were content to remain ignorant of the functions, goals, and procedures of the other agencies, Doolittle's professionals and students viewed their lack of knowledge and the accompanying lack of communication between and among agencies as the problem of highest priority. That problem has not disappeared as a result of this project, but progress has been made in dealing with it. The contact between professionals and students which occurred in the meetings allowed for an interaction which stimulated new perspectives among the participants about one another and, more important, on what they were doing at Doolittle. According to the respondents, the sense of isolation of each group of professionals from one another which gripped Doolittle cannot be exaggerated. For some of the participants this feeling of isolation persists, although it is somewhat diminished. Conversations with some participants revealed that they wanted more opportunities for communication with others at Doolittle but that somehow these opportunities were lacking. Nevertheless, despite the continued belief by some professionals that they still do not know much about the activities of the other agencies, the evidence shows that their overall knowledge of the larger system has increased.[1] And with this increased knowledge, the ability of the staff to serve the students has increased, as has their recognition of themselves as integral and vital parts of the educational program at Doolittle. Moreover, their feeling that there is greater freedom to initiate communication with administrators and other staff has increased.

For the students who participated, the experience in many respects was very positive. For them, as for the professionals, there was an increase in their sense of identification with Doolittle. Their isolation was lessened as they joined in the task of articulating their individual perceptions and complaints to the other participants in the project. Some, perhaps for the first time, found that they had an opportunity to express their frustrations about the system at Doolittle and that their comments were accepted as valued contributions to the discussion. Misconceptions could be dealt with directly in the meetings but valid complaints surfaced and were included in the group reports.

Some of the students discovered, however, that before some of the problems in the system could find some solution, it would be necessary for the service agencies to confront and attempt solutions to their own problems. Through participation in the program students developed a more realistic appreciation of the agencies and of the professionals with whom they had to deal. The effect of this new appreciation, however, was probably more positive than negative. It gave at least some of the students a truer sense of their own power, and of their own ability to help themselves and others in the system, whether student or professional, and to understand how it works. Further it pointed out to some extent that in some respects the students were the freest agents in the Doolittle system.

Confusion over Educational Objectives

The system at Doolittle and at higher administrative levels failed to deal adequately with the problem of the lack of clarity and agreement as to the academic/vocational objectives of the program. This confusion, it was found, was not unique to Doolittle. The open discussion by Doolittle students and staff enabled certain concerns to be voiced which would not be expressed in a less open and accepting atmosphere. The participants, perhaps without realizing it, had identified one of the persistent bones of contention in adult basic education. But it is one thing to identify dissonance and quite another to have to live and work with it. Perhaps the problems for administrators, staff, and students which attended this particular issue might have been less acute if it had not been for the sharp rise in unemployment in the United States which struck not only at the highly skilled and educated but also the men and women with little or no skills and no financial reserves. In a vigorous, booming economy vocational objectives in Doolittle's program may be more clearly delineated and more easily achieved, both by the students and by the educational system than in a period marked by a savage slump.

---

[1] See Appendix Table K for some of the data on "Knowledge of the System."

One of the factors, too, which may account for the confusion of educational objectives among the professional staffs lies in the training which they have had prior to taking their present jobs. For many, particularly the caseworkers, a liberal arts educational background had given them an orientation which in some ways is antithetical to the conception of education having a vocational bias. For these persons, the latter type of orientation seemed somehow a prostitution of education. Young staff members whose own liberal education was a prerequisite to employment may find it difficult to acknowledge and accept the extent of vocational orientation in their own formal education.

One result of the meetings held as part of the Doolittle project was to expose this problem for all to see. That it existed and continues provides some basis for suggesting that either the larger system had not recognized the pervasive nature of the problem or that its administrators prefer not to deal with it. In this context, it is useful to note the continuing and insistent demand by the professionals for more and better training.[1]

More than anything else, perhaps, this interest in additional training may have indicated the existence of a morale problem. The questions: "What am I doing here at Doolittle? What am I supposed to be doing here at Doolittle? Where are we going? How can I help get us where we are supposed to be going?" all can be understood as legitimate pleas for direction from supervisors and administrators. Despite the fact that, indeed, some headway has been made in providing more support and direction, solution of the particular problem of clarifying the educational objectives at Doolittle remains far from being solved.But the closing of the gap between the official and the "acceptable" goal at Doolittle will require efforts on the parts of both administrators and staffs of the various agencies. Some rather cherished "ideals" may have to be modified and perhaps broadened to tolerate a broader range of goals.

---

[1] See Appendix Table L for types of training desired by professionals.

Participants' Sense of Power to Make Changes

Students and professionals have looked to the administrative components of the agencies as the sole sources of power, information, knowledge, and potential for change. In this sense, many of the professional staff may not have felt much more power to change or improve the system than the students did. In the planning of the project with the Joint Advisory Committee, indications of this sense of powerlessness came out in the comments of some of those who were in responsible administrative positions in the cooperating agencies. Despite these doubts, the JAC chose to attempt to make changes and had sufficient confidence in the staffs of the various agencies to call upon them for the contributions they could make in the type of project that was planned.

No direct measures of whether participants' sense of powerlessness has decreased as a result of the project were attempted. The students may have benefitted the most in this respect. The student participants were learning every step of the way both about the system and about how to have an impact upon it. In the process, there was a visible growth in their ability to communicate their concerns and to express their suggestions. The boost in their confidence in themselves and in their ability to express some control over their environment was increasingly evident with each meeting and in individual interviews.

Evidence that professionals at Doolittle, after participating in the project, felt any drastic lessening of their sense of powerlessness is scant. Some caseworkers and teachers took it upon themselves to improve their knowledge and skills by either bringing "experts" of one sort or another into Doolittle to speak to one of the groups or by attending outside educational activities. But the general impression of the project staff, as a result of interviews and observations of the staff in the project meetings, was that there was an extraordinarily strong bias on the part of professionals to wait for somebody to "do" something to them or for them in terms of training. The recognition that there was a great reservoir of potential resources available to them both from within their own groups and the surrounding community just never seemed to occur. Surely if the participants wish to think of themselves as skilled practitioners in that aspect of the Doolittle program to which they are assigned, and they feel that their agency is not helping them sufficiently, then they are going to have to seize upon the problem themselves.

It was found that while the caseworkers, for instance, were continually claiming that they were not getting any training, their supervisors believed that a good deal was being imparted. Part of the problem, it seems, was that the supervisors were not clearly delineating that aspect of their meetings with workers which the supervisors understood to be training. Also the staff apparently did not feel free to express their feelings to the administrator. The reliance on informal methods which has tended to mark training at the CCDPA worked against their being successful among a group of workers who were anxious for and receptive to more formal methods of instruction. Most of the workers, it should be remembered, were recent graduates of colleges and universities and have been attuned to more formalized educational formats. Throwing them into the sea and hoping they will swim, an attitude which appears to pervade Midwest as well as other schools in the system, seems a less than progressive way in which to tackle the problem of integrating workers into their agency and their jobs. Certainly it is not efficient and may well be quite negative relative to the progress, the eventual success and the well-being of students.

This traditionally informal approach to training is supported by the fact that supervisors have also been conditioned by the system to maintain routines rather than to attempt continuously to encourage innovative behavior. Complicating the situation for the supervisors, moreover, has been the manpower shortage and the turnover problem, particularly in the CCDPA. The strains that occur affect the supervisors as well as the workers and supervisory efforts to formalize their training may not be high among their priorities, despite a possible net positive result from this expenditure of effort. Teachers, caseworkers, vocational counselors, and their supervisors may wish to look into educational opportunities available to them in the Chicago area. Some of these activities may be free and some may qualify for some type of tuition refund by the employing agency. The professional staff might also consider approaching their superiors with the idea of inviting various authorities in areas of interest to the staff to come to Doolittle for discussions. Supervisors, for their part, might look toward improving present mechanisms and creating new ones for regular, routine exchanges of information on problems and problem-solving both within and between the cooperating agencies. Conscious attempts to turn staff meetings into sessions where staff might receive new insights into their jobs and into solving problems in their classes or caseloads might prove very rewarding to all concerned.

Although some might have predicted that once the students found out that the combined staffs of the various agencies were often as confused by the system as they were, the students would have lost confidence in these professionals. This did not happen. If anything, the level of trust and confidence between students and professionals probably rose. Data collected indicated that the students at Doolittle, whether participating in the project or not, started out with a high regard for the professional staffs of the agencies involved at the school. In the smaller sample of students who had been involved in the project, this respect apparently was reinforced by the interaction of the meetings. (See Table VII, page 34.)

Accordingly the approach used in this experimental project of encouraging frank, open, discussions about problems of the individuals and agencies concerned can be seen to improve the opinions the individuals had of one another. Further, since the data suggest that the level of interpersonal trust has risen, this change alone is likely to improve communication intra- and inter-group in the future.

Cooperation in Data Collection: Assumptions and Reality

The idea of having a series of people coming into an organization engaging in questioning, probing, and generally getting in the way, is not very inviting to people deluged with work. Those who served as collectors of data, whether at Midwest or Doolittle, instead of being received coolly received warm receptions from virtually every person contacted. By and large, the interview segment of the data collection proceeded rather well. The problems that did creep up came in the questionnaire portion. Even here the problems were well within the acceptable limits of difficulty found in most such research projects. In only a very few cases did professional personnel offer resistance at completing the questionnaires.

One of the problems which seemed to affect the project almost from the beginning was the absence of WIN from the initial stages of the planning process. This was not intentional. However, their absence until fairly late in the process may have led to a less than adequate perception on the part of the earlier planners of what role WIN was to play. WIN, throughout the project, seemed somehow to exist on the fringe of things. There is a physical distance between the agencies and a minimal contact between WIN and Doolittle teachers and caseworkers. A few meetings cannot overcome these problems. Another aspect of the problem, however, concerned the collection of data and the monitoring of changes related to the project at WIN. In brief, WIN was relatively neglected, at least in comparison to the attention that Doolittle teachers and case workers received.

One comment which derives from observations made at WIN is that WIN has grown quickly and, sometimes, rather turbulently. In the process of that growth the program has had battles with other agencies, including the CCDPA. For the most part those battles are now over, and resolved in favor of WIN. There seemed to be a tendency for some individual WIN staff members to pass on to new workers negative feelings toward other agencies, notably CCDPA, without realizing that the cultivation of those negative feelings are not particularly functional to these workers.

Changes Occurring Independent of the Project

It would be presumptuous to assume that all changes which have occurred in the Doolittle Family Education Center since November, 1970, have been caused by the project.

At least four potentially significant changes have occurred during the past six months which apparently were independent of the project. They have had effects on the progress which may or may not have been made on the project recommendations. The first of these changes is that the Doolittle School has had two changes of principal since the December meetings. These changes in head administrator within the school have effects largely independent of the project. As a result of the initiative of the new principal, certain identifiable changes have taken place.

Any institution which is in the throes of multiple changes in its top leadership level is likely to be "treading water" waiting for the new administrator to provide leadership. It is also true, however, that changes in top level administration within an organization frequently provide new opportunities for innovation and leadership which the more entrenched patterns of relationships and operation do not so readily allow. Any changes at Doolittle must be looked at within the framework of two changes in the principalship of the school, but should also be viewed in terms of the potential for change and initiative that those changes provided. Examples of these changes may be noted in the curricular modification imposed by Mr. Murphy, who dropped shops, and Mr. Grimes, who introduced an increased level of teacher involvement and initiative in selecting curricular materials.

A second structural change which has occurred, independent of the project, is the reorganization of WIN into teams based on the Peer Group Concept. Any organization which is undergoing pervasive internal reorganization, learning of new roles and behaviors, and uncertainty among the personnel, is likely to expend more of its energy dealing with its own internal problems than it otherwise would; thus leaving less time and energy, and perhaps less creative thought, available to deal with the problems related to the clientele and other organizations with which it works. However, this reorganization should also have provided opportunities for the organization to adapt itself in new ways to make use of the resources available in the other agencies and to develop cooperative approaches to the problems of the clientele in the ABE Centers. So, one sees again that what might, in one sense, be an obstacle to full implementation of the project recommendations, in another sense has potential for increasing the organization's ability to respond more fully to the problems and solutions proposed in the project.

The third major structural change which has occurred independent of the project is the transfer of the Welfare Rehabilitation program of the CCDPA to the control of the Department of Labor. It may be too early to determine the full impact of this change, but it did have negative effects on morale among CCDPA personnel. Possibly this change and the indecisive situation which preceded the move itself served to stifle definitive action to implement the proposed suggestions. Nonetheless, the shift may actually provide potential for new initiatives to be exercised in a newly altered system.

The fourth change involved the arrival of a new supervisor for the case work staff early in the year and the departure of a veteran, the Vocational Counseling Supervisor, after the bulk of the project meetings had been held. The Case Work Supervisor has unquestionably had a positive effect on morale and the performance of his workers. Whether the project opened the way for his selection or whether it helped to create an environment which supported and reinforced innovativeness on his part remains open to question. The loss of the ocational ounseling upervisor was felt by his staff. His departure also meant that the project staff couldn't monitor his follow through on project suggestions throughout the life of the project.

From the perspective of the project staff the occurrence of personnel changes and structural changes in the agencies involved is neither favorable nor unfavorable to the implementation of the proposed solutions. Although institutional change does make it easier for agency personnel to think about existing problems from new perspectives and to consider new functional arrangements of personnel to accomplish agency goals, the forces of habit and the almost automatic repetition of earlier ways of dealing with problems constitute an obstacle to change. The existence of other change -- those not a part of the project plan -- may either foster or retard the accomplishment of the proposed solutions depending entirely on the viewpoints of the persons involved.

New Equipment

New equipment has been introduced into the school and there has been a substantial increase in the number and variety of materials available to students and teachers. Some of this took place as a response to the project recommendations; some had been ordered prior to the initiation of the project. The overall effect of conducting a project of this type in an organization may be to encourage and speed up changes that were offstage awaiting introduction. Further, the attendant publicity within the agencies involved may have tended to make administrators a bit more likely to deal promptly with requests from Doolittle than might otherwise be the case. On the other hand, it seemed that the agencies involved did not, in fact, exhibit any detectable preferential treatment for Doolittle over that of the other centers.

Monitoring of the Project

One of the assumptions which the project staff had made, perhaps naively, was that the solution implementation duties had been made sufficiently explicit so that change would occur without prodding from the University representatives. This assumption proved untenable because it was discovered that, in fact, the level of specificity of the solutions was not quite as high as had been thought. Probably the main factor which accounted for the lack of specificity in designating who would implement each solution can be traced back to the discussion leaders and in turn to the apparent inadequacy of their orientation and supervision. It was decided that the monitoring of the implementation of project recommendations at Doolittle and WIN could be initiated after six to eight weeks of time had elapsed following the conference meetings. If it had been begun earlier, the monitoring might have had a greater effect.

The monitoring efforts were complicated, too, by the fact that data collection was occurring simultaneously and this tended to dilute the potential effect and influence that monitoring might have achieved alone. Also, the vast bulk of the monitoring was directed toward the public school and public aid components of Doolittle with somewhat less attention being paid to WIN. It appears that there may have been more contact with the students than with WIN personnel.

A contributing factor both to the diminished adequacy of the monitoring activity and of the data collection generally was the fact that graduate students, many of whom worked on a voluntary basis, were often torn between the demands of the project and those of their own studies. There was an uneven level of involvement on the parts of the volunteers and some were much less aware of the workings of the project than others. The result was that monitoring and data collection of some project staff was done with greater precision than that of others on the staff. It should be remembered, however, that the bulk of the money allocated for the project was directed toward those teachers, public aid staff, WIN staff, and students who participated in the project. If monitoring is to be included as an integral part of the working model then it would seem reasonable that in any future projects of this nature more funds should be set aside to pay staff. The large amount of volunteer effort on the part of University of Chicago students must be understood as one of the hidden costs of the project.

The project staff did come to the conclusion, however, that monitoring of the project was a valuable experience. The fact that there was somebody around to look into progress in implementation tended to encourage attempts at implementation. This presence helped to break the inertia that had apparently existed during the first two months after the December 12 meeting.

It also gave a lift to those who had participated. They may have felt that their work had not been taken seriously or that there was no real continuity to the project. Monitoring helped maintain the momentum that the meetings generated. There was even a positive element in the fact that University personnel were associated with the project as group leaders, as monitors, and interviewers. Some of the Doolittle students and staff may have welcomed the opportunity to express their feelings and perceptions with concerned and sympathetic, but trained and objective listeners. Those conversations may have had quite positive effects on the self-esteem of those contacted, and in a situation where maintaining one's self-esteem may sometimes be a problem, this would be no mean achievement. Nevertheless it seems clear that knowing exactly who is going to do what, when, and where is essential to effective implementation and monitoring.

Methods of Selecting Participants

We believe that questionable methods of selecting volunteers from WIN staff, the Doolittle teaching staff, and students, tended to limit the range of opinions which prevailed. A broader spectrum might have surfaced if a more representative sample from each group had been allowed or encouraged to participate. By and large, the participants tended to be the more articulate and, possibly, the least alienated of the Doolittle staff and students. All of the CCDPA staff participated, including their clerical staff. These clerical personnel provided many insights and their often greater knowledge of public aid procedures than that of the caseworkers may have served to establish new bonds of respect between the two. The CCDPA group reports were better with the clerical staff's contributions than they might have been without them. The other participating agencies either did not invite or encourage their clerical staff to participate in the project. The project staff was not allowed by the initial Doolittle Coordinator to contact the teachers and discuss the project with them. The Coordinator took that responsibility upon himself and may not have reached all of those teachers who might have been eager to attend, if only they had been invited. The project staff recruited student participants from the Student Council which turned out to be made up to some extent of students appointed to their positions by the school Coordinator rather than having been elected by their fellow students. WIN's administrative personnel appeared to emphasize the selection of professional personnel although the greatest number of volunteers came from the group of "coaches."

Attendance and Achievement

Although the data demonstrate that there was improvement within the attendance patterns at Doolittle, inferences in interpreting these data should be made cautiously. Some of the most difficult data to obtain were those relating to attendance since attendance figures are reported in various ways within the different agencies. Another difficulty in making comparisons of average daily attendance across schools relates to the way student rolls are kept active. The project team received attendance and enrollment data from three sources: (1) the Doolittle and Midwest records, (2) the CPS central office and (3) the CCDPA central office. These data are contained in Tables XVII, XVIII and XIX.

Enrollment and attendance data received from the schools show a 42 per cent increase in enrollment during the 1970-71 year at Doolittle compared to a 12 per cent increase at Midwest. On the other hand the report on central office CPS figures shows a 13 per cent increase in enrollment for Doolittle as against a 11 per cent increase at Midwest. These differences occur because of the discrepancies in both the September and June figures at Doolittle as reported by the school and the central office. (Tables XVII and XVIII). Average Daily Attendance (ADA) has increased at both schools with Doolittle school's rate of increase slightly higher than Midwest; e.g., Doolittle 45 per cent to 55 per cent; Midwest 47 per cent to 52 per cent. (Table XVIII).

A daily attendance roster was sampled directly from the Doolittle Center to substantiate these CPS central office figures and absences were computed based on enrollment figures to determine whether absences had decreased. These data, reported in Table XX, corroborated the fact that the Doolittle absentee ratio has decreased; the average per cent of absentees from September to June was 51 while the per cent of absentees from February to May was 45. Whether these data reflect a typical seasonal rhythm or indicate an actual change in the pattern of absenteeism is not known.

The data on enrollment from CCDPA (Table XIX) indicate a higher turnover rate in students at Doolittle than at Midwest. On the average, thirty-six Doolittle students were dropped from the rolls per month as compared to 20 Midwest students. It was reported to the project staff that enrollees who did not maintain attendance were dropped much more quickly during this school year than they were in the past. Again, it is unclear whether the higher number of students dropped at Doolittle as compared to Midwest reflects a "cleaning up of the rolls" at Doolittle or is a natural result of new procedures of open enrollment at Doolittle, or a factor which is related to the lower number of CCDPA personnel at Doolittle which potentially means less supportive services to keep students active, once enrolled.

In order to find some easily available indicator of achievement the records of GED students attempting and passing the GED exam at each center were examined. First data were collected to determine the relative size of the GED program at each center. Doolittle has a larger proportion of GED students

TABLE XVII

STATISTICS ON ENROLLMENT AND GED COMPLETION OBTAINED FROM THE DOOLITTLE AND MIDWEST CENTERS (Reported by Numbers of Students)

	Doolittle	Midwest
Enrollment:		
September, 1970	299	276
June, 1971	425	308
Total increase in enrollment	126 (or 42%)	32 (or 12%)
No. Students added (Sept.-June)	594	530
No. Students dropped (Sept-June)	342	452
Students passing GED	41	33
Students failing GED	19	5

TABLE XVIII

DOOLITTLE AND MIDWEST ENROLLMENT AND AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE FIGURES AS OBTAINED FROM CPS CENTRAL OFFICE (Reported by Numbers of Students)

Month	Doolittle				Midwest			
	ABE	GED	Total	ADA	ABE	GED	Total	ADA
September	234	83	317	150 (47%)	220	57	277	132 (47%)
June	270	88	358	196 (55%)	284	24	308	159 (52%)

than Midwest. In September 26 per cent of the Doolittle students were enrolled in the GED as compared to 21 per cent at Midwest. In June these figures were 27 per cent and 8 per cent respectively (Table XVIII). The CCDPA data availble for each month of the project show a yearly average of 19 per cent of the Doolittle students in the GED and 15 per cent at Midwest (computed from an average of 59 out of 310 [Doolittle] and 50 out of 337 [Midwest] being enrolled in the GED). Using these average figures as a base (Doolittle 59, Midwest 50) then the ratio of GED students taking the GED exam from Doolittle is 60/59 as compared to Midwest's 38/50. Doolittle had many more students who attempted the GED actually and proportionately than Midwest. Of those taking the GED exam 46 per cent of the Doolittle students were successful as compared to 87 per cent of the Midwest students. It is important to recognize that these figures cannot be compared directly without taking into account the size and composition of the enrollment.(Doolittle's total enrollment and percentage of GED students is higher than Midwest's), the turnover rate (Doolittle's rate is higher than Midwest's), the resources assigned to the program (there is a much heavier CCDPA case load and therefore less of a support system per capita at Doolittle than at Midwest), and the policies regarding dropping students and admitting students to the GED program.

TABLE XIX

DOOLITTLE, MIDWEST ENROLLMENT FIGURES AS OBTAINED FROM CCDPA CENTRAL OFFICE[1]

Month	Doolittle				Midwest			
	ABE	GED	Total Enrollment	Net Dropped	ABE	GED	Total Enrollment	Net Dropped
September	230	69	299	37	220	65	285	13
October	201	63	264	19	210	45	255	4
November	233	49	282	38	276	56	331	11
December	220	35	255	31	265	55	320	9
January	215	40	255	31	293	54	347	59
February	207	36	243	15	343	58	401	17
March	246	54	300	76	347	42	389	30
April	284	65	349	24	350	37	387	4
May	336	90	426	28	281	43	324	0
June	340	85	425	59	286	41	327	50
Average	251	59	310	36	287	50	337	20

---

[1] CCDPA reported enrollment in June at Jackson 384, Hilliard 216, and Montrose 115.

TABLE XX

DOOLITTLE ATTENDANCE BY TEACHER WITH MEAN RATIO OF ABSENTEES TO ENROLLEES, STANDARD DEVIATION, RANGE OF RATIOS AND MEDIAN RATIO[1]

PRE-TEST					POST-TEST				
September - January N = 14					February - April N = 11				
Date	Mean Ratio of Absentees/ Enrollees	s.d.	Range	Median Ratio	Date	Mean Ratio of Absentees/ Enrollees	s.d.	Range	Median Ratio
9/10	.66	.14	.47-.87	.66	2/3	.48	.10	.31-.60	.49
9/21	.47	.10	.32-.69	.46	2/9	.47	.13	.31-.71	.46
9/29	.46	.17	.00-.69	.48	2/17	.42	.11	.31-.67	.38
10/7	.48	.16	.27-.77	.44	2/23	.48	.12	.31-.73	.44
10/16	.53	.14	.34-.85	.49	3/1	.45	.13	.13-.61	.48
10/26	.50	.16	.15-.79	.59	3/8	.43	.11	.15-.55	.47
11/4	.46	.13	.22-.69	.47	3/12	.51	.10	.32-.64	.51
11/13	.55	.11	.26-.70	.43	3/18	.43	.12	.26-.60	.43
11/23	.52	.13	.35-.73	.53	3/24	.39	.13	.19-.57	.36
12/3	.44	.12	.21-.62	.47	3/31	.47	.11	.30-.67	.46
12/11	.57	.10	.36-.69	.59	4/6	.45	.09	.36-.62	.43
12/21	.56	.14	.24-.75	.56	4/13	.46	.11	.27-.65	.45
1/7	.57	.12	.33-.74	.61	4/19	.41	.13	.23-.65	.38
1/21	.48	.14	.27-.70	.49	4/23	.51	.14	.20-.67	.54
Total	.51	.05	.42-.60	.53	Total	.45	.06	.36-.56	.44

---

[1] Attendance was computed for every sixth school day, omitting holidays, for the pre-test, and every fourth day for the post-test.

It was reported to the project staff that Doolittle students were now being encouraged to take the GED exam even if the student was not as prepared as he/she might like to be in order to give the student experience in taking the exam. It was also reported to the project staff that students who did not maintain their attendance were dropped much more quickly than they had been in the past. It no longer is as easy for students to sign a roster and just simply leave the school as it had been in the past. Moreover, CPS communication with CCDPA regarding flagrant absentees from classes and school has unquestionably improved. Furthermore, over all achievement for all students at Doolittle is an issue which cannot be assessed by looking at the results of the GED tests. It would appear that as a result of the elimination of the compulsory shops that opportunities for students to concentrate on academic areas of study have been enhanced. The introduction of the still fledgling tutorial program has allowed for greater individual attention to students' educational needs. The increase in the number of textbooks makes the students' work more convenient. Knowledge is simply more readily available. Conditions today at Doolittle are clearly much more supportive of student learning than they were at the outset of the project.

In the course of interviews with teachers, administrators, and students, the project staff was struck by the fact that entirely too much attention is being paid to fluctuations in test results. The students had expressed the desire to know more about their rate of progress, or lack thereof, through the program. The increasing use of tests and the transmission of the results back to the students theoretically should have met their request. Under the best of conditions, this process might effectively work to buoy student achievement. The problem is, however, that teachers and other professional staff forget to question both the validity and the reliability of the tests. The idiosyncratic use of tests tends to yield idiosyncratic results. Changes in student achievement, even measured by the tests in use, should be compared not with Midwest but with the past record at Doolittle. Even here, though, not too much faith can be placed in the reliability of the earlier figures. Unfortunately, only gross comparisons can be made.

In conclusion it can be said that there is a trend toward higher daily attendance, that more students are being encouraged to take the GED, and that the increased flexibility of the curriculum, along with more feedback to the students on their progress has led to a higher morale among students concerning their achievement. It would therefore appear that the system is somewhat more efficient and effective than it was prior to the project.

Communication about the Project

There were indications both in the questionnaire and interview data that the students felt a greater responsibility to pass on to their peers what the experimental project was all about than did the teachers. Somehow there was a failure on the part of the project staff and the participants to tell the other professional staff at Doolittle what was transpiring in the project. An increased effort to tell others about the project activities might have heightened the potential for constructive change in the school. Greater involvement on everybody's part at the school towards institutional improvement tends to reinforce the impetus for change. The lack of communication about the experimental in-service training project between professionals in the same agency (CPS) working in the same school was pronounced. It may well be that the tendency mentioned earlier in this chapter to leave things to chance and the administration, without taking responsibility for personal thrusts toward change, is manifest also in this instance. Two basic problems persist: a less-than-ideal acceptance of a sense of personal responsibility and a lack of a feeling that exercising leadership is appropriate for individuals at all levels of a bureaucracy.

Effect of Outside Agent

The experience of the project staff appeared to confirm the assumption that the involvement of an outside agent would be advantageous to the participants in providing the stimulus for calling the meetings, in facilitating the deliberations and in encouraging the implementation of changes suggested by the group. The atmosphere of the meetings was decidedly supportive and every participant had numerous opportunities to express himself. Most took full advantage of these opportunities. The group leaders, all of whom were essentially neutral in their orientation toward Doolittle, assisted the participants to articulate the problems and solutions which the participants themselves identified. The words and thoughts in the reports of the November and December meetings are those of the participants. The fact that the group leaders consciously and consistently demonstrated an integrity toward those words seemed to be instrumental in fostering an environment in which thoughts were freely expressed. The reports, which faithfully reflected those ideas, also contributed to what appeared to be a high level of trust and confidence among the participants and between the participants and the project staff. The group leaders were in no position to be judgmental, had been instructed to avoid showing biases, and evidently made no attempts to do so, a fact which was probably appreciated by those in the various groups. Among the functions the leaders served was mediating drastic misunderstandings, prodding the groups to clarify their statements, and helping the groups differentiate between fact and opinion.

The trust engendered by the project staff appeared to carry over into the monitoring and data collection phases of the study. Again, the fact that these individuals were independent of the agencies involved in the project served to encourage open and deeply felt responses from those who were interviewed. This was true regardless of the level in the administrative hierarchy of the individual interviewed.

All in all the project staff concluded that even though the project achieved appreciably less than was hoped for in some respects, the desirable changes which were empirically documented or intuitively sensed justified the efforts and provided the experience needed to modify the experimental in-service training program. The revised model is presented in Chapter VI.

CHAPTER VI

A REVISED IN-SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT MODEL FOR ADULT BASIC EDUCATION MULTI-AGENCY SYSTEMS

The experience of the project director and staff in the experimental in-service training program involving the Doolittle Family Education Center has led to a rethinking of both the assumptions and operation of the model. In this chapter the experiences which are seen as reflecting an inadequate operationalization of the model are presented together with strategies for overcoming these weaknesses in another setting if the model of in-service training for facilitating self-initiated program improvement is to be utilized.

In conceptualizing the processes of problem and solution identification it was assumed that everyone--staff, professional personnel of the three agencies, and the student representatives--all understood that much more than a "rap" session would be involved. That is, although no attempt was made to minimize major societal problems such as the level of unemployment and the prevalence of racial discrimination, these factors were not defined as lying within the intended area of problem and solution identification. Further, while it was acknowledged that the policies and practices of all three agencies at higher administrative levels than those immediately involved in the Doolittle system were in some cases contributing to and aggravating problems in the operation of the program at Doolittle, the announced purpose of the project did not include an effort to modify the behavior of agency personnel who were not intimately involved in the Doolittle system. The intention of the project designers was rather to stimulate, encourage and facilitate discussion of the behavior of persons who work or study at Doolittle. It was believed that if the actors in the system could share their perceptions of the factors limiting the success of the educational program at Doolittle, they would conclude that an appreciable number of the problems could be solved merely by a change in the behavior of individuals at Doolittle. In other words, the design of the project was intended to raise the consciousness of the students and professional personnel concerning their power to bring about program improvement without waiting for a change in formal agency policy or administrative initiative from higher levels within the agencies involved.

As it turned out, the group discussion leaders were not successful in maintaining their group's focus on the changes which they themselves had the power to make. Whether the group leaders fully comprehended the reasons for focusing on problem and solution identification that would be under the control ofthe participants who attended the meetings in November and December is not clear. What is clear, however, is that the reports from the homogeneous groups showed only a glimmer of recognition that the members of the groups were creating some of their own problems and that they had the power to improve the situation by modifying their own behavior. Instead, the homogeneous groups tended to place the responsibility for the problems on other groups. Later, when they were reorganized into heterogeneous groups, they tended to concentrate on problems and solutions that required the active involvement of agency administrators in the upper regions of the agency hierarchies.

It seems clear, in retrospect, that a project of this sort which is designed to persuade students and professional staff of their ability and power to conceive and initiate program improvements cannot be maximally effective if the participants are permitted, or in fact assisted, in identifying problems which lie outside their power to correct.

The dysfunctional consequences of permitting the students and professional staff to identify solutions which they were impotent to perform became evident as the University team began collecting data to document the changes which were being made. It was not surprising that the administrators of the three agencies did not feel compelled to endorse all of the recommended solutions and to take the steps called for in the report of the December 12 meeting.

In every case in which the power to implement the solutions was located within the Doolittle system, appreciable progress was made. However, when the students and professional staff met on May 22 to evaluate the project accomplishments they concluded that for several of the problems they had identified, few of the recommended solutions had been implemented. Accordingly their over-all evaluation of the success of the project tended to be less favorable than it might have been had the problem and solution listing been confined to those areas in which the participants possessed the power to act.

Based on the reasoning and the experience presented here, it might be concluded that nothing of value resulted from the groups' identification of solutions which they were powerless to carry out. On this basis an appropriate plan of action might be conceived of as explicitly discouraging or preventing the identification of problems which could only be solved by individuals outside of the Doolittle system. Yet, to do so would deprive the higher administrative personnel in the three agencies of information they might otherwise have great difficulty collecting. Also, it seems unlikely that the discussion leaders would have been able to develop and maintain a good working relationship with their groups if the group members got the impression that only personnel at their level of the administrative hierarchy within their agencies were being asked to change their behavior to make the system better.

Accordingly, it seems useful not only to permit and assist the participants in identifying situations which they can control but also situations lying outside their area of direct influence because (a) the participants may be aided to see that while there are problems which others must solve, there are problems they themselves have the power to solve; (b) the participants are permitted to enjoy the freedom of officially and openly identifying system problems which they did not create and cannot correct; and (c) the problems identified and the solutions advocated by the students and local level professional staff of the three agencies are brought to the attention of administrators at the higher levels of the agencies, who then have, usually for the first time, a written record of the problems and solutions perceived by staff members at the operating level by students. With regard to this third point, the implementation of solutions regarding changes in agency policy often requires effort over a period of months or even years. Accordingly, the fact that no action had been detected by the students and staff engaged in the project regarding the implementation of some of the solutions they had recommended is not a final assessment of the worth of the recommended solutions. Administrators of all three agencies have been and continue to be immersed in the solution of problems. They have examined the series of reports on the project seriously and appear to be taking steps to implement those changes which lie within their assigned domain of decision making.

From the standpoint of the model refinement, then, the wisest course of action seems to be to permit the participants to identify problems and solutions which they can deal with and those which others must treat. Then, the discussion leaders can clarify the situation by assisting the group to classify the solutions into two categories: (1) solutions they can implement, and (2) solutions which can only be implemented by others.

The second critical insight which the University personnel gained in working through the project is that no structure for cooperative problem-solving was generated at the Doolittle Family Education Center as an outgrowth of the project. Without a structure to facilitate the communication process and to provide an audience to review reports of progress achieved and problems encountered, the local system tends to continue to function in its habitual ways. The external agent is evidently the individual who is best able to engineer the development of such a structure because he is least likely to be perceived as favoring or threatening any agency. This structure might be called a program improvement committee which, while it would have the freedom to explore any problem, would not have executive powers. Instead its influence would be exerted through the persuasiveness of its recommendations. Just as the agencies have authorized the official designation of a Joint Advisory Committee for the total program, each local school might similarly impanel a joint program improvement committe representing all the agencies and the students as well.

The basic assumptions of the model which were presented in Chapter II continue to appear valid to the project staff. However, the execution of the project has yielded insights regarding the implementation of the model which necessitate the explication of a procedure for the application of the in-service training model. The approach which now seems most likely to produce an increase in the capacity of the students and professional staff of an ABE center is as follows:

1. An agency administrator of one of the groups officially involved in the operation of the program or an external agent such as a professor of adult education begins the process by concluding that the existing adult basic education system is not functioning in an acceptable manner and that it can be changed in a positive direction through the cooperative efforts of representatives of all of the groups involved.

2. The initiator must clarify the dimensions of the problem; that is, he must determine whether a single school is to be involved or all of the schools in a school district, or some larger geopolitical unit. For the purposes of this description the single school is assumed to be the unit involved.

3. The initiator must arrange to persuade administrators from all of the agencies involved in the operation of the program at the ABE center to cooperate. This persuasion should be essentially educational involving the presentation of the basic assumptions and the process to be followed in a voluntary, self-help in-service training plan for program improvement. Only after the administrators from all agencies concerned have approved the participation of personnel from their agency in such activity should the planning proceed. If an external, presumably objective agent has not been involved to this point, then an individual such as a professor of adult education who is proficient in group leadership skills should be sought to serve as the director or coordinator of the project. Arrangements will need to be made to assure that this external agent will not be perceived as a representative of any one of the cooperating groups.

4. Funds must be secured to pay equitably the personnel who will be involved in the project.

5. The project director is given the opportunity to present the assumptions and suggested procedures to the professional personnel of each agency. This explanation serves two purposes. First, it exposes all of the agency personnel to the project. Second, it provides a vehicle for recruiting volunteers. The atmosphere must be open and non-threatening so that the audience will feel free to ask any questions.

6. The counsel of the Student Council or other representative group of students is sought regarding the decision about a way of selecting student representatives to participate in the project. This procedure is then used to make the actual selection.

7. The project director recruits discussion leaders and identifies individuals to serve as recorders for the training meetings. An orientation to the project is conducted to be certain that all personnel comprehend the assumptions of the project. The recorders will have the responsibility of preparing written reports following each of the meetings which present the discussion and agreements of the individual groups.

8. A series of four planning meetings and one evaluation meeting for the entire group is scheduled.

9. At the first all-day meeting of the volunteers from the agencies and the representatives of the students, each homogeneous group identifies those problems or conditions it believes are limiting the effectiveness of the program. These problems are placed in a priority ordering by the group. The recorder prepares a report of the discussions and the conclusions which were reached. These reports are then mailed to all of the participants in all of the homogeneous groups.

10. At the second all-day meeting the volunteers from each agency and the student representatives reassemble in their homogeneous groups to develop a list of solutions to the problems they had identified at the preceding meeting. These solutions are identified as (a) those which can be implemented entirely on the basis of local initiative, and (b) those which cannot be implemented without the active involvement or official approval of an administrator or a number of administrators from higher hierarchical levels of the agencies involved. Reports of the discussions and conclusions are mailed to all participants following the meeting.

11. Local administrators of the agencies involved are invited to participate in the third all-day meeting. These administrators were not invited to the preceding meetings because their presence constitutes a potential inhibiting force

which might impede the free flow of discussion regarding problem identification and solution formulation. The administrators will have received the reports of the second meeting before they attend the third.

After the group reports have been presented orally at the opening general session of the third all-day meeting, the total body of participants is divided into heterogeneous groups consisting of an equal number of students and of representatives from each of the agencies involved. The task of the heterogeneous groups is to combine the listings of problems and solutions from each of the homogeneous groups into new listings on which they have reached agreement. The recorders prepare their third reports at the end of the day's work and these are distributed to all participants.

12. At the fourth all-day meeting the heterogeneous groups are brought together to hear the discussion leaders present the reports of the groups to the total group of participants. After adequate opportunity has been provided for participants to request clarification of the points presented by the discussion leaders, the heterogeneous groups reassemble to reconsider their priority listing of problems and solutions and the classifications of the solutions. The project director, discussion leaders and recorders should encourage and assist the participants in developing highly specific solutions which are directly addressed to those individuals who have the authority to implement them. Further, the identification of criteria which can be used to assess progress in the implementation of the solutions should be attempted.

Following the discussions in the heterogeneous groups the entire group will reassemble to arrive at a concensus on the priority ordering of the problems and solutions. This session is to be chaired by the project director. At the close of the session each participant should have a clear idea of the role he is to play in implementation.

13. The report of the final planning meeting is developed as a cooperative activity involving the project leader, discussion leaders and recorders. The report, which must clearly identify the individual or individuals who are expected to implement each specific solution, is sent to all participants, to administrators of the cooperating agencies, and to directors of comparable centers for their information.

14. Within one month after the fourth meeting and the mailing out of the report, the project director invites the participants to an informal discussion at the educational center to review progress and the problems which have been encountered. At this meeting an effort is made by the project director to work out arrangements so that a monthly meeting will be held regularly at which progress and problems will be discussed. For the first few meetings the project director or

his assistant will take notes and prepare a brief written summary for distribution to all who attended that meeting as well as all those who had attended the fourth planning meeting. These regularly scheduled progress reporting sessions may tend to stimulate additional activity because of peer pressures and because of the publicity given the program improvement efforts through the preparation and distribution of the reports of the discussions. This local program improvement committee should be assisted to become self-sustaining by the project director's gradual relinquishing of initiative, so that when the project director withdraws from the activity, the work of the committee will continue.

15. Between the time of the fourth meeting and the evaluation meeting the project director and his assistants will collect whatever data are required to provide evidence on the extent to which the solutions have been implemented. Further the project team will prepare their own analysis of the activity. These data and the project team's perceptions of the project will be written up and distributed to all of the participants in the project prior to the evaluation meeting.

16. At the all-day evaluation meeting the participants will reassemble in the same heterogeneous groups they had formed for the third and fourth meetings. Their tasks will be to review the progress report, to assess the amount and kind of change which has taken place, and to reassess the priority listing of problems. The groups will also attempt to identify the reasons why some of the solutions have not been implemented as a prior step to considering what, if anything, should or could be done to facilitate implementation.

In the afternoon the participants will reassemble in one large group to share their perceptions of what occurred and what they believe should now be done. Chairing this discussion is the last official group activity in which the project director will be involved.

17. Following the evaluation meeting the project director and the discussion leaders will prepare the final report on the project showing the extent to which the solutions advocated by the participants have been implemented. The data to support the conclusions consists of quantitative data and other evidence collected through interviews with the participants. The second major aspect of the report is the evaluation of the effectiveness of the approach in the estimation of the project director and his assistants. Suggestions are to be included indicating ways in which the approach might be improved.

This final report is prepared in sufficient quantity to give each participant ready access to it. Other copies are to be distributed to directors of comparable programs and to other individuals interested in attempting to utilize newer methods of in-service training as a means of improving adult basic education programs.

The reader will note that the revised model suggests a number of activities and emphases that may have been missing from or inadequately treated in the execution of the program described in this report. What is suggested, however, is not meant to be the ultimate model for organizing in-service training. Instead it is presented by the writers as a serious attempt to improve on other approaches which have been used. As knowledge advances, changes are inevitable. Accordingly with each succeeding attempt to utilize the model additional knowledge should be gained which will add to the utility of the model. Thus, while a perfect model will not likely ever be produced, the cooperative efforts of all those involved in the attempt to improve programs should yield an approach which is both practical and effective. Progressive refinements are essential to make it so.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Material in this chapter is organized around the following questions:

(1) What were the successes and failures of the Doolittle project?

(2) What recommendations can be made based on the analysis and interpretation of data collected for (a) the Doolittle Center and (b) the agency network of which Doolittle is a part?

(3) What implications does this experimental project hold for the CCDPA-CPS adult basic education program?

Successes and Failures.--The success of the Doolittle project must be evaluated in terms of the expectations of those involved within the project. The Doolittle personnel and students could be expected to evaluate the project on the basis of whether or not the solutions to problems identified during the project were implemented. At this level of analysis the project at this time has more failures than successes. There was no meeting of central administrators to define objectives more clearly; there is no guidebook; there is no plan for more organized orientation and in-service training for agency personnel; there was no evaluation of teaching methods; there are no additional caseworkers; and there was no plan devised to coordinate and improve counseling service among the three agencies. On the other hand, there was a WIN Task Force; there is the promise of two WIN teams assigned to ABE students; and of a WIN Liaison spending two or three days each week in the school. There were some in-service meetings for teachers held, some of which involved CCDPA personnel; there is an improved student orientation program; there is an active student council which has been officially recognized by the principal as the Local Educational Council; there has been an increase in the amount and type of curriculum material and equipment within the school; there have been some changes in the organization and content of the curriculum; there has been an increase in student-teacher interaction and improved student/teacher rapport; there is an improved mechanism to obtain CCDPA allowances in an equitable manner; and there is a promise that in the future WIN checks will be delivered to the school by the WIN Liaison.

An important aspect of the project was the potential for increasing communications and the knowledge of other agencies. The process of collaborative problem-solving brought agency personnel and students together on an equal basis for the first time. There is evidence that within this process agency personnel and students become more knowledgeable about the policies, personnel and procedures of each agency, and for some persons, the philosophy of their colleagues (as well as their own) regarding education became more clear. In this face-to-face interchange all persons involved found they could cooperatively set about constructively analyzing and solving problems. Agencies and names became faces and people which in and by itself allowed for a more tolerant and constructive attitude. On the other hand the process failed in some respects because of the inability of the project staff to recognize the limitations of the process. Problems were identified and solutions proposed which could not be solved at the operational level. Because problems and proposed solutions were not separated into two categories, i.e., those to be solved by participants and those to be referred to agency administration, there were expectations raised about the success of the project which could have been unrealistic. Also, the project staff failed to guide participants into the task of assigning specific responsibilities and establishing a time table for the implementing of solutions. This failure, along with the inability of the project staff to begin monitoring earlier, delayed implementation of the solutions and the reexamination of the locus of responsibility for solution implementation. Another shortcoming of the project was the inability of the project staff to make both the objectives of the project and the assumptions of the model clear to all potential participants. There was not a full realization by the conferees that they were implicitly assumed to be the active agents in implementing the solutions they had identified.

At another level of analysis, and one which is important to administrators, there are other successes and failures of the Doolittle Project. While it is true that the records reflect an increase in attendance, there is also evidence to show a very high turnover rate of students at Doolittle and it appears indisputably valid to assert that there is no easy solution such as a change in curriculum materials to alter what appears to be a very complex set of causes and effects operating among a number of variables within the Doolittle system. However, there are some conclusions regarding the larger system which can be reported from the visits to the Doolittle Center and conversations with personnel in the three agencies which deliver services there. These conclusions will be grouped around four major concepts: student involvement, problem analysis, agency morale, and institutional renewal.

The project staff feels that the Doolittle project has demonstrated great potential for the system in terms of what has been learned about student involvement. The data support the conclusions that students contacted by means of the questionnaire, interviewed directly or observed at the school in action have a greater sense of involvement in the process at the school, a greater sense of freedom in utilizing curriculum (broadly conceived), and a growing awareness of the complexity of the problems encountered at the center and therefore a growing sophistication in their perceptions of problem solving. The project staff recognizes that there is a great potential of energy for the solution of problems and a potential for minimizing absenteeism and disengagement from schooling if students could somehow be involved more fully with their own educational process beyond involvement which is token or extra-curricular. What it does imply is that students can be educated into a process which may be as important as academic achievement--the process of problem identification and problem solving as a part of the educational experience. In this way adult students who have not been exposed to extensive middle class socialization processes which are necessary in assisting one to succeed in the world of work, can begin to appreciate the importance of and gain experience in group skills, group leadership, the defining of alternatives, and the development of individual initiative and responsibility within large organizations.

Another concept which has implications for all agencies deals with the creation not only of problem-solving mechanisms but an attitude among personnel regarding their responsibility to use these mechanisms. It would be naive to think that if every problem which could be identified within an organization could be solved today that there would be no problems tomorrow. Realistically, agency administrators face the fact that there will always be intra-agency, and in the case of cooperating agencies, inter-agency problems. What the Doolittle project teaches is that problem-solving mechanisms can be generated, if desired, at any level of an agency or inter-agency structure, however complex. The project staff is convinced, although it has not yet been demonstrated by the project data, that personnel can be trained to use problem-solving mechanisms by exercising initiative and personal responsibility. This essentially means that an individual would not pass responsibility for a problem up the line or across agencies without first dealing with that problem in terms of his own authority and responsibility.

Another concept which the project staff feels has emerged from the Doolittle project is the importance of group morale within complex agency structure. When three large agencies are involved in delivering service to one clientele there is an increased potential for frustration among personnel and the recipients of the services because of the increased complexity of carrying out institutionally prescribed functions. If agency personnel are not aware of the varying functions and specific goals of the other cooperating agencies, the modification of procedures or specific agency philosophy becomes almost impossible. As each agency seeks to defend its own priorities, it becomes increasingly difficult to admit personal or agency failures or personal or agency responsibility for the problems encountered. All of these factors, as increasing pressure is placed on rendering inter-agency service efficiently, place severe strains on personnel. The result may be a lowering of group morale as fewer and fewer psychic rewards are obtained from the intrinsic nature of the work itself and more and more dependence is placed on monetary rewards. The project staff has observed that individuals caught in these dilemmas must develop ways of coping with increased pressures to deliver services, mounting obstructions perceived as coming from other agencies, and less and less psychic rewards for expended energy. Transfers, disavowment of performance accountability, projection of agency problems on the clientele, and "scape goating" other agencies are some of these mechanisms. Accordingly, it becomes extremely important that efforts be made to encourage a positive climate not only within but also between agencies. This fact has many implications for administrators especially those at the higher echelons of the agency who influence not only orientation programs but also retraining policies to keep older agency personnel in step with changing situations. This kind of flexibility within organizations, which allows for the modification of goals, policies and procedures and the growth of new institutional forms, appears to be basic to the maintenance and promotion of morale.

Closely allied to the concept of group morale is institutional renewal which the Doolittle project illustrates. At this moment in history accelerated change in our society requires institutions to find ways of quickly accommodating and adapting to new arrangements within the shifting external environment. A few years ago CCDPA personnel took the leadership in developing an educational program in concert with the CPS for those persons receiving public assistance. This program was hailed nationally as a program ahead of its time. It appears to the project team that scarcely had the CCDPA and CPS developed the institutional apparatus to encourage an efficient and effective coordinated program that another accommodation has been required, which in effect challenges many of the existing mechanisms which had been developed to date. The rapidly expanding WIN program, whose energies are rapidly consumed in trying to develop an appropriate structure, needs all the assistance and expertise in developing cooperative arrangements which CCDPA and CPS have acquired in the years they have cooperated. On the other hand, WIN personnel need to recognize that WIN's growth and addition to the inter-agency nexus severely taxes the existing structures of CCDPA and CPS. It would seem imperative for each organization to recognize the effects and counter-effects these changes have on one another and to realize that the health and survival of the entire cooperative enterprise are dependent on mutual trust and cooperation. If the energies of the three organizations could be marshaled to concentrate on a building of a new prototype of an ABE program for persons on public assistance there is no reason to think that the Chicago program could not be rated once again as a program ahead of its time. On the other hand, a rigidity of structures and procedures could have the unintended consequences of not only performing a disservice to the clientele which each agency serves but also causing severe blows to the flexibility and vitality of the three institutions. Accordingly, the Doolittle project which, in microcosm, mirrors the problems of the agencies which cooperatively deliver services to its students demonstrates the need for each agency to seriously consider what mechanisms are needed within its organization to allow for institutional renewal.

Recommendations.--Recommendations which focus on the Doolittle center are:

1. The Doolittle project has laid a base for continuing cooperative activity among agency personnel and students which, if encouraged and nurtured, could make the Doolittle Center an exemplar of an adult basic education program.

Accordingly procedures could well be initiated at Doolittle by Mr. Grimes, Mr. Wilhelm, Mrs. Sperling and the Student Council president to formalize a continuing plan of stimulated communication and cooperation between these groups which will insure an understanding of problems as they emerge at the Doolittle Center. This plan should include a mechanism whereby there is a continuing critical self-examination in an atmosphere which is open to experiment with change and which places the responsibility for these actions equitably on students, CPS, CCDPA, and WIN.

Furthermore, in these procedures there should be a conscious effort to establish norms which would prevent the passing of responsibility up the line or across agency lines for making changes which can clearly, or perhaps only possibly, be made by operational personnel within the Doolittle Center.

Each group, in and by itself, might also reflect on its own shortcomings and, by means of self-criticism, attempt to improve its own members' individual responsible behavior.

2. There are few problems within the original list of problems and proposed solutions which cannot be dealt with in some manner by Doolittle personnel and students. It is therefore recommended that the Doolittle personnel, students, and

WIN Liaison (on arrival at Doolittle) reexamine the list of problems reconsidering those things which could be done within the Doolittle Center groups by themselves. Learning from the problems encountered during the project, individuals might volunteer to initiate the implementation, specify the criteria to be used to measure progress, and propose a specific timetable to insure either implementation or reporting back.

3. Since it is the project staff's conclusion that an inter-agency problem-solving mechanism in the long run is more important than the solution of any single present problem, it is recommended that: (a) a Doolittle Program Improvement Committee representing the four groups be constituted to act as monitor for the problem-solving process, and (b) that Mr. Grimes place within his annual budget a line item for outside consultant services, if, at any time, the Doolittle Program Improvement Committee has need of an outside agent to assi in maintaining the inter-agency problem-solving mechanism.

4. Mr. Grimes' action in officially recognizing the Student Council as the Local Educational Council (LEC) is a move toward increasing responsible student participation. Now it seems useful to encourage the Council and Area A resource personnel to develop a plan to educate the student body as to the role and functions of the LEC. This increased responsibility of students for the quality of the educational experience at Doolittle, in the project staff's opinion, indicates that student participation is encouraged by the administration and could serve as an important mechanism to utilize student energy not only to assist the school but give valuable leadership experience to students.

5. Since the Child Development Unit at the Doolittle school was conceived philsophically as an important aspect of a family education center the project staff was disappointed to learn that the personnel staffing that portion of the program had not been invited by the Coordinator to be active members of the Doolittle project. The initiative taken by Mrs. Coleman in joining the project had important effects on the communication patterns within Doolittle according to the data. It is therefore recommended that Mr. Grimes and the Master Teacher of the Child Development Unit meet with the Doolittle Council to explore ways in which this unit could become more effectively integrated into the total Doolittle program.

6. Since it is apparent to the project staff that student involvement in the decision-making processes was a salient feature of the Doolittle project and since it was also apparent that some students lack group work skills which appear to be prerequisite to such involvement, it is recommended that: (a) Mr. Wilhelm secure a replacement for the Group Worker vacancy as soon as possible and that this person be an integral member in curriculum planning so that students may be organized in small

groups not only around their common interests but also so that the content of the small group meetings might also serve to enrich the academic offerings of CPS. It is further recommended that this person be utilized to teach cognitive material to students regarding group formation, maintenance and decision-making, as well as serving as a process observer in meetings to improve the quality of all group meetings at Doolittle.

(b) Student leadership and initiative should be encouraged by allowing students to develop short-term courses or activities supplemental to the curriculum which would allow for the added flexibility and relevance within the curriculum which was called for by members of the Doolittle project. In this way subjects such as art, music, and black studies could find some expression within the curriculum.

(c) Since the assembly initiated by Mr. Grimes and Mr. Wilhelm appeared to be well received, it is recommended that students and administrators cooperatively work out regular all-school meetings which could involve students in the planning and implementing of programs and increase the variety and quality of the student experience within the school.

7. Since Doolittle teacher and CCDPA communication patterns were low compared to their Midwest counterparts and since the physical arrangements at Midwest allow the offices of the principal and CCDPA to be in close proximity, and since it appears that the Doolittle Child Development unit which is housed along with the CCDPA office in a separate portion of the building also is isolated from the main communication patterns, it is recommended that Mr. Grimes and Mr. Wilhelm reassess the location of the CCDPA office vis-à-vis the CPS central office.

8. Since very few WIN personnel have ever been to Doolittle (or any other CPS location) and since all team members can potentially counsel students, it is recommended that Mr. Grimes issue an invitation through Mrs. Sperling to all team members to visit Doolittle and to meet CPS and CCDPA personnel and observe the program. Furthermore, since the coordination of the counseling functions among the three agencies appears to be an important issue for selective recruitment, rapid progress through the system, and efficient transfer of students to receiving agencies following Doolittle, it would seem reasonable for Mrs. Sperling, Mrs. Drubeck and Mrs. Montgomery to agree upon and implement some plan which would allow the most efficient use of the combined counseling services of the three agencies available to students.

Recommendations which focus on the inter-agency structure of which Doolittle is a part are:

1. Because of the evidence which the project staff has seen regarding the importance of attendance and achievement as

barometers of the vitality of the program at any one location and because there is evidence to indicate that the attendance reporting systems in use at the day centers are not uniform, it is recommended that a single way of maintaining attendance figures which satisfies all agencies be devised and maintained. Further it is suggested that a common procedure for all schools be developed for obtaining benchmarks, not only in terms of average daily attendance, but also in terms of the rate of progress of any one student through the CPS system. This information, because of its importance to the chief administrator and lawmakers, becomes important to local administrators of the cooperating agencies and their personnel. It is therefore recommended that these figures for all centers be made available on a regular basis to all local administrators and publically posted for the benefit of agency personnel and students.

2. Since the project data indicated that staffing, particularly within CCDPA and to some extent within CPS administration is inadequate, it is recommended that Mr. Herman conduct an assessment of CCDPA staffing, the manner in which cases are transferred in and out of the school office and the way case loads are reported from the school to the central office to make certain that all schools are staffed by some objective standard based on a common manner of determining staffing needs. The Doolittle CCDPA office appears to be understaffed and it is recommended that additional caseworkers be assigned to Doolittle, and that the Vocational Counselor's job description be reviewed to assess the reasons why counselors report that they are not able to carry out their primary function.

It is also recommended that Dr. Lehmann explore the possibility of providing more supportive personnel to the principal. The project staff's experience, both in the experimental and control school, indicated that the principal's time appears for the most part to be taken up with security problems, ordering of materials, making up budgets, doing his own typing or duplicating, and counseling students and that there appeared to be inadequate time left to provide in-service training, to visit classes, to evaluate and counsel teachers, to develop curriculum, or to increase or update his own knowledge in the field of adult education.

It is therefore recommended that an administrative assistant or a master teacher be assigned to Doolittle to assist the principal in his work.

3. Data from the Doolittle project indicate that interagency communication at the operational level is a problem perceived by students and all agency personnel. It is the opinion of the project staff that this perception is correct and furthermore, not confined to the Doolittle Center. Therefore

it is recommended that: (a) Dr. Lehmann, Mr. Herman and Mr. White authorize the distribution of informational literature from their agencies to the operational personnel of the other two cooperating agencies; and (b) Mr. White contact the principals in all the centers with an offer to extend the services of a resource person from his agency to explain the WIN program to CPS and CCDPA personnel and to see that names and telephone numbers of personnel within the agencies are exchanged; and (c) consideration be given to assessing the present Joint Advisory Council to determine its adequacy in encouraging inter-agency communication. Since WIN is not now formally represented on the JAC, since not all centers are represented on the JAC, since 35 per cent of the WIN trainees are at the five centers and since the bulk of ABE in CPS is carried on in the day centers, it seems reasonable to suggest that some type of joint committee should be constituted on a permanent basis to attend to the specific problems of communication and interaction at a level which involves all centers. It is recommended therefore that Dr. Lehmann, Mr. Herman, and Mr. White consider the utility of either reconstituting the JAC or constituting a new committee to encompass personnel within the three agencies. It is also recommended that administrative personnel from each agency in each CPS location meet with this committee at least quarterly so that there will be adequate communication between local administrators and the committee.

4. Since it became evident that Midwest CPS personnel utilized the Doolittle reports as a basis for instituting curricular changes and since Midwest had volunteered as an experimental school at the initial presentation of the project it is recommended that Dr. Lehmann give every consideration possible to providing the Midwest Center with an opportunity to develop a full scale in-service training program similar to the Doolittle project.

Implications of the Doolittle Project for the CCDPA-CPS Adult Basic Education Program.--The adult basic education program of CCDPA-CPS is larger than the adult day centers and the WIN program. Originally the Doolittle In-Service Education Project was designed as an experimental project which potentially might serve as a model to bring increased effectiveness and efficiency to the entire program.

In the opinion of the project staff there is no logical reason why the model used in the Doolittle project is not appli cable to any position of the system. In this report weaknesses of the model and its implementation have been included and suggestions have been made regarding its modification for future use. It is the considered opinion of the project staff that an external agent is necessary for the effective use of the model. It is also noted that this approach does not obviate the use of more traditional approaches to in-service training, when and if these approaches are used in conjunction with the model. In and by themselves classroom or clinical approaches to in-service in a multi-agency operation are not adequate.

Therefore it is recommended that Dr. Lehmann and Mr. Herman consider the possibility of bringing an overall plan for in-service training to all personnel within the two agencies both in the day centers and evening schools based on the Doolittle model and supplemented by the more conventional approaches to in-service training. It is apparent to the project staff that the problems surrounding ABE programs are such that much more flexibility is required in the curriculum and supportive services than is now available in the CPS-CCDPA system. There is in 1971 much more experience to be drawn upon in designing and implementing programs than there was up to 1965 when the Adult Basic Education Act was passed. On the other hand it is important to take into account the structures which have been built up in the last several years of the present Chicago program. Accordingly the Doolittle model could serve to create institutional renewal throughout the system and at the same time utilize the existing structures and personnel as the renewal mechanism.

Finally, those who are involved in the process of adult education are not likely to lose sight of the fact that progress requires change. Consequently not only is it necessary to work continuously at improving the structure and functioning of adult basic education programs, but also it is essential that similar efforts be devoted to the refinement of models of intervention and in-service training.

The Doolittle Project, which is notable for many reasons, exemplifies the attitude of cooperation that will be required in other settings if adult basic education programs are to be made more effective in meeting the needs of students and of the society of which they are a part. In addition, the experimental attitude expressed by the participants has not only led to a refinement of the model, but also has provided the justification for concluding that the experimental in-service training program is viable.

APPENDIX A

PROPOSAL FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF ADULT BASIC EDUCATION IN THE ADULT DAY CENTERS OF THE CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS SYSTEM

Submitted by

Dr. Herbert Lehmann

for

The Joint Advisory Committee, Cook County Public Aid
and City of Chicago Board of Education

April, 1970

Introduction

The Joint Advisory Committee, Cook County Department of Public Aid and the Chicago Public Schools has been concerned for some time with developing an in-service program for personnel employed in the ABE programs throughout the city. This long-time concern culminated in the proposed plan of in-service training developed by William S. Griffith at the request of the Joint Advisory Committee. The original plan, presented in December, has since been under advisement by a Sub-committee on In-service Training, which has, through discussion and mutual agreement, provided the detailed planning.

The proposal is seen as an experimental project, limiting the opportunity for in-service training to the five adult day time centers; following the experience of this training it is hoped that further and continuing in-service training might be offered to professional personnel throughout the adult basic education program in Chicago.

This proposed training program has two objectives: the increased efficiency and effectiveness ofthe adult basic education program in Chicago and a research component which will add to the basic knowledge and understanding in the field of adult basic education.

In the past the Chicago plan for bringing basic education to the educationally disadvantaged adult has led the nation as a place for progressive and innovative ideas. It is the feeling of the Joint Advisory Committee that Chicago should continue to be a source of innovation and continue to exert its resources in taking leadership in what now has become a major educational enterprise throughout the country.

Abstract

On July 10 an Institute Day will be held at the Jackson Adult Center with all personnel who are involved with the adult basic educational programs from the five adult day centers in attendance, including WIN teams. The centers will be closed to regular activity in order to free the personnel for this activity.

In the morning, top administrators from the Cook County Department of Public Aid and the Chicago Public School will address the participants, indicating their perspectives on the place of adult basic education in their agencies. A community spokesman will also speak to the group indicating how the citizen views the adult basic education program.

The proposed in-service training plan will be then outlined for the participants and each center's personnel will be invited to consider the plan as a group following lunch; participation in the training program will be voluntary but the decision will rest with the group not the individual. WIN teams will consider the proposal as teams and volunteer for the proposed training as a team.

The remaining portion of the day will be turned over to Dr. Lehmann who will take responsibility for the remainder of the program.

The Sub-committee on In-service Training will meet, following small group meetings and based on the number of adult education centers and WIN teams who have volunteered for training, make the selection of the group or groups to be trained. Six graduate students from the University of Chicago will be available on the Institute day and for the remainder of the proposed in-service training to act as resource personnel for the groups and to carry out the data collection for research purposes under the direction of the sub-committee.

Following the Institute day and at a time interval convenient for all involved, five more days of training will be organized for the Center's personnel who will be involved in the training. Four of these will be held within a four-week time interval; the fifth day, which is concerned with evaluation, will be held in the fall. The remaining five days of training will involve a number of students from the chosen center; all training days will be held at a conference center on non-school time and all participants will be reimbursed on a per-diem basis. Administrative representatives from the public school, public aid, OSPI, and the WIN program will work closely with the Sub-committee in directing the training program.

Proposal

Probably the most important basic assumptions undergirding the proposal are (1) the most important problems connected with the program are so complex that no "authority" or "expert" could be expected to provide the solutions, (2) the major problems associated with the program are known to students, to teachers and to Department of Public Aid staff but their perceptions are not congruent and presently there is no effective means to facilitate communication among these groups.

Whatever deficiencies exist in the program are not attributable to the professional workers' knowledge. Instead, program weaknesses are most likely to be a consequence of inadequate communication among all of the parties involved.

A great many public aid recipients have problems they would like to learn how to solve. They would participate in an educational program if the program dealt with their felt needs in a manner acceptable to them.

An adult is behaving in a logical way if he withdraws from or drops out of a program which he does not believe is related to his needs if he believes he is powerless to influence the nature of the program.

The solutions to the problems lie not in having educators, psychologists, sociologists, or professors of social work lecture to teachers, students and case workers, for the problem is not that there is somewhere a tested body of knowledge containing the answers. Neither is the answer to be found in any set of curriculum materials produced by authorities in adult basic education. Instead, the problem may well reside in a lack of common understandings and mutual trust and respect among the parties involved.

If the foregoing assumptions appear valid, then it seems reasonable to invest effort in an experimental procedure designed to open avenues of communication, to foster and strengthen mutual respect and trust, and to facilitate cooperative planning in resolving the problems. Accordingly the following general outline is proposed as the basis for developing a more detailed plan.

Meeting I

At this session all of the teachers in the day centers, the WIN teams and the Department of Public Aid professional staff who work with the students who attend these centers would participate. Key administrative personnel from the Board of Education and from the Department of Public Aid would speak to the group and point out the most pressing problems with the program as seen by the chief administrator of each agency. The objective sought here would be that of convincing the audience that major problems exist, that the rate of progress exhibited in moving toward solutions is unsatisfactory, and that the heads of both agencies face a serious need to improve the effectiveness of the program.

Following the addresses pointing out the problem, the plan for an experimental in-service staff development program would be presented. One of the conditions for participation in the experimental program will be that both the teachers and the case workers from a center must all agree to take part in the program. Probably initially only the students and staff from one center can be involved in the experimental group. It is conceivable that two experimental groups might be used if there is sufficient interest. In any event there must be control groups, that is day centers not involved in the program, to make comparisons possible and to estimate the influence of the experimental treatment.

Following the explanation of the proposed program, the personnel from each center would meet in their own groups to consider whether they wished to be involved in the project.

Meeting II

The second meeting will be held at some neutral location and will involve teachers, caseworkers, WIN teams and a representative group of adult students. Discussion groups will be led by representatives of the University of Chicago and each group will have no more than nine persons. Each group will have students, teachers, case workers and WIN team members. Members of the four groups will not work together and the only times they will be together at the second meeting are at the orientation session and at the group lunch.

The most important activity for the second meeting is that of identifying the problems associated with the program. Each problem will be described and the problems placed in order of their importance. At the end of this day we should have lists and descriptions of the major problems associated with the program from the perspectives of students, teachers, case workers and WIN team members. These lists will be duplicated and mailed to all of the participants so they will have time to read and to think about them before the third meeting.

Meeting III

Having read and thought about the problems identified from all three perspectives, the participants will return to their homogeneous groups to attempt to map out procedures to overcome the problems they had listed earlier. While some groups may decide to reorder their list of problems, all groups will be working on what they believe to be the best solutions to the problems. At the end of the third meeting the participants should have succeeded in outlining practical solutions to the problems they have listed.

It seems reasonable to assume that the solutions proposed will entail a modification of behavior on the part of individuals in all four groups. So the reports of each of the four groups will be of considerable interest to those who are being asked to change their behavior. Recorders will prepare the reports for duplication and distribution prior to the fourth meeting.

Meeting IV

At this stage the students, the teachers, WIN teams and the case workers, as members of homogeneous groups, will have clarified their notions regarding the major problems and the ways of working toward their solution. To begin the fourth meeting a panel of four - WIN counselor, student, case worker, and teacher - will present the reports and recommendations of their respective groups to the entire body of participants. Administrators from the Board of Education and from the Department of Public Aid will be permitted to direct questions - but not asked to give answers - to the panel.

When the members of the panel have finished discussing among themselves, members of the audience will be invited to ask questions - not to make speeches or announce answers. Then the group will be divided into discussion groups of no more than nine persons with each group composed of equal numbers of case workers, teachers and students. The responsibility of the discussion groups will be to take all of the information from all four homogeneous groups and from the panel discussion and to arrive at a listing of problems and solutions agreeable to all members of the group. Copies of the reports of each group will be reproduced and given to all of the participants.

Meeting V

The purpose of the fifth meeting is to present the reports of the discussion group and to arrive at consensus regarding (1) the priority ordering of the problems, and (2) the approach to be used in working toward the solutions.

When the group has reached consensus on the priority listing of the problems and the manner of attacking each one, administrators of both agencies will be ready to entertain questions regarding the limitations or restrictions which may exist in dealing with the problems. Further, these administrators should be able to commit additional agency resources where appropriate.

Following the fifth meeting the group will have a plan of attack and will set out to implement the plan. Activity will be observed by personnel of the University of Chicago who will also be collecting data from one or more centers not involved in the experiment.

Meeting VI

At some yet to be determined time interval after the fifth meeting, the members of the group will assemble for a day to evaluate progress and to make a judgment on the adequacy of the approach. From a practical standpoint the result of the sixth meeting should be the determination of the value of the program and the judgment of whether or not it should be expanded.

APPENDIX B

On October 5, 1970, the Chicago Board of Education adopted the following report:

> Approve proposal of Joint Advisory Committee composed of staff of Board of Education and Cook County Department of Public Aid to conduct a series of six one day curriculum workshops for their personnel at Doolittle Family Education Center and employ consultants from the Department of Education, University of Chicago to obtain research data and make recommendations to improve relevancy of instruction and raise attendance levels in adult basic education programs conducted by the Chicago Board of Education.
>
> During the seven years of operation of the adult basic education program the average attendance in the day adult basic education centers has been approximately sixty percent (60%). Varying techniques based upon observation have not changed this attendance pattern appreciably.
>
> Since no basic research is currently available to suggest possible other directions, it is the opinion of the staff of both the Board of Education and the Cook County Department of Public Aid that curriculum workshop participation by teachers, caseworkers, adult basic education students, and University of Chicago consultants will result in providing the required information to improve the relevancy of the instruction and thereby encourage better attendance by the adult basic education students.

The research design will use the Doolittle Adult Education Center as the experimental site, and the Midwest Adult Education Center as the control site.

APPENDIX C

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
5835 S. Kimbark
Chicago, Ill. 60637

Doolittle In-Service Project
November 7, 1970
Group Reports

The following four reports came out of the group discussions held on the first all-day session of the Doolittle In-Service Training Program.

WIN Teams
Group Leader - Eunice Neal
Group Recorder - Holly Wicker

Primarily the WIN group feels that the overall problem of Doolittle Family Education Center is that the program is not structured to meet the individual needs of the students.

Priority of Problems:

1) Students are not treated as adults through the teaching methods and attitudes utilized at Doolittle.

2) There is no communication between the four groups (WIN, CCPA, teacher and students) about the qualifications, and resources available in the separate agencies.

3) Students do not have the freedom to choose to enroll in school, nor to choose their curriculum and goals.

4) The curriculum for everyone is geared to the attainment of the GED and does not meet individual needs. At the same time the courses taught for the GED do not teach what is needed to pass the GED.

5) The goals set for the students are not realistic. The student body is composed of three basic types of students: (1) those forced to attend school; (2) those who attend to socialize; and (3) those who really want to learn. There is really only one goal for all three types of students and the students are divided only in terms of their reading scores, ignoring their individual goals and situations.

Other Problems:

a) Motivation - within the school students are not provided with motivation towards their goals. They experience more failure situations than success ones.

b) The entire operation is understaffed.

c) The referral procedure between Doolittle and WIN is not understood. The students are referred when they don't meet qualifications for WIN, are accepted, and then they are expected to perform as qualified WIN students.

d) Resources are limited in all agencies - supplies, books, and money.

e) Doolittle attempts to provide both vocational education and basic education. The two emphases tend to detract from each.

Teachers
Group Leader - Dennis Day

1) Lack of communication between the three agencies on a day to day basis, also in terms of the function and role of each agency and how it relates to the student. (Students and teachers are unclear of the function and role of WIN)

2) Human dignity is not considered enough by some persons in all of the agencies working with Doolittle. (Students often complain of unfair and discourteous treatment on the part of certain persons within various agencies).

3) Not enough in-service meetings between all agencies involved.

4) Misguiding and misinformation is given to students before coming to Doolittle by those responsible for student recruitment. (Student expectations for programs and placement are too often limited by what the program can and does offer.

5) Students receive incorrect information on prerequisites for referral, which creates confusion and some misunderstanding on how referrals are made.

6) Too few vocational programs available to the students after leaving Doolittle or,at least, there is a lack of information and referral about them. (Many students are unable to find employment which is fitting to their vocational preparation).

7) There are notppovisions made for the training of students who seem unlikely to reach GED status. (Students who choose not to or are unlikely to obtain the GED are not being provided with other adequate training programs).

8) Lack of information on screening students with medical and emotional problems. (A student may have interest in a vocation for which his/her physical or emotional condition may be incompatible.

9) Lack of dissemination of information on physical as well as emotional history or condition to the teachers. (e.g. students often need glasses in order to see the blackboard; teachers are often unaware of these types of physical limitations).

10) Lack of vocational, professional, guidance, testing and placement. (Students are too often unaware of their potential as weall as of their limitations for a chosen career).

11) Lack of immediate follow-up by the Department of Public Aid and counselors to document why students have been absent for a number of days.

12) Not enough recognition of student achievements. (Students are given little, if any, credit for their daily achievements and successes).

13) Lack of pre-vocational shops causing students to repeat some shops many times.

14) Shortage of equipment in shop areas.

Students
Group Leader - Thomas Brady

Problems and problem areas as perceived by ten students in the Doolittle In-service Project as major obstacle as major obstacles to learning at the Doolittle School.

After six hours of discussion and interaction the ten students in the Doolittle project agreed that the major problems and obstacles to an effective educational process could be grouped into six general areas or topics in the following order:

1. Finance
2. School Facilities and Security
3. Teachers and School Administrators
4. Curriculum and activities
5. Materials, supplies, and equipment
6. Social workers, supervisors and their relationship to students

All of the students participate freely, voluntarily and unhibitedly and discussed at length those factors, influences, attitudes, conditions and situations which they believed affected their study and progress at the Doolittle School.

Finances

In th- discussion of finance, all agreed in essence that the amount of money they received was not enough to provide adequate clothing for themselves and their children too. Summer clothing was not so much a problem as was winter clothing. It appears that no additional money or not enoughtmoney was provided to buy the extra clothing needed for winter. The common complaint was that the cost of coats for winter exceeded the limited amount of money included in the monthly allowance. The students stated too that money for paying the babysitter was needed; the average cost for two children was in excess of thirty-five dollars a week, some students were successful in finding a friend or someone who would babysit as a personal favor for less than the thirty-five dollars. In some cases it was done for twenty-five dollars a week. When clothing and babysitting could be managed, students said that money for lunch was lacking; of the three needs requiring more money than is normally available, lunches were considered the least critical. Babysitting was the next least critical, and clothing was most critical. The students agreed that the insufficient funds dispersed by check did not arrive regularly nor on time. Checks due on the 15th and 30th of each month were always late, often as much as seven to ten days. Some timmes the check did not arrive until the next one was due.

An additional item which was distracting was the knowledge that families which have the same number of dependents received different amounts for food stamps; and in some cases the difference was racial in that white recipients received more money than did black recipients for food stamps and, other allowances. Several instances were cited as examples of racial differences and family differences.

School facilities and security was the next category of problems considered most distracting. Toilet facilities for male students are located on the first floor and classes are held on the third floor; some of the male students are not able or are unwilling to reach the first floor in time to use the toiletllocated there, and this use of the stairway, hallway or other place is especially noticeable in the summer. Water fountains in the building are inadequate. They were designed for children and are unrefrigerated. Adult students (female) are embarassed to stoop to get water especially when wearing short skirts and high hemline dresses.

There is no first aid station or health room at the school. Minor cuts, bruises, abrasions or injuries cannot be attended or treated at the school. Security or locker space is needed for personal belongings. If lockers cannot be provided, then a locked room would be adequate. Speaking of security, unauthorized persons can walk into the school building at will, and they do. These unauthorized persons include undesirable persons or persons who are seeking opportunity to steal from or molest students.

Classrooms used are overcrowded with students sitting too close for comfort and privacy. There are other rooms in the building which are not being used, and it seems that using some of the other rooms would eliminate the crowded conditions in the classrooms.

Teachers and school administrators seem to contribute to the problems in a way which cannot be considered as helpful. For example, some of the teachers talk above the students' heads using language and terms unfamiliar to the students and offer no explanation of the term, nor do they seem to be aware of the students' state of confusion. Many of the teachers are not available for students to meet with and from whom they may ask information and clarification of issues raised during class. Other teachers seem to lack interest in the student, often look out through the window, appear preoccupied in thought and oblivious of the student or the student's welfare in the classroom; and other teachers do not use the materials available for class use, often leaving it locked up in closets or pantry in case of food. Students get little benefit from the materials not used.

The administrators on the other hand should admit students who meet the eligibility requirements rather than allowing the student to attend class for eight weeks then inform him that he is not eligible. Such a practice causes hardship on the student who may be led to believe that he will be paid for school attendance. Some students are so anxious to attend school that they try to go even when it's a hardship and a sacrifice to go.

Students needing assistance in planning their programs seldom get the need satisfied. No counselor explores the students needs nor helps the student in planning his program .

The curriculum and activities is fourth in the list of problems identified by the students. The most common complaint was that students do not review the material presented during an eight-week period prior to taking an examination on that material. This complaint also is applied to the GED test in a general way. Students stated that some of the material on the examination is entirely foreign to them. They stated that they did not expect the test to be taught but practice in taking written examinations would help in taking the GED test.

The students suggested that the Doolittle program should be organized similar to the regular high school program wherein students change classes and teachers for different subjects. Students should be allowed to select those subjects in which he wishes to enroll. The program should lead to a definite goal with a graduation ceremony signifying completion of the program. They felt that recognition of their achievement would enhance their self esteem. At present the courses are completed in eight weeks and the students feel that sixteen weeks would be more meaningful to them in terms of developing skills or acquiring knowledge. In the prevocational training more exposure to modern office equipment should be provided. Today's office machines are automated and include electronic and electric or powered typewriters. The typewriters at

Doolittle are all of the manual type. At least some familiarity with the electric typewriter is desired. Clerical training in addition to typing should be offered. One source of complaint was the study period. Students stated that the study period was a waste of time. Some want to use that time for additional classwork, academic students could take typing or sit in on other classes in session or even organize additional classes. At the present time no studying of value is possible in the so called study period.

The fifth area included materials, supplies and equipment. Discussion focused on the textbooks and class use of supplies. Students stated that the books used were at a level not appropriate for their advancement. The use of the same text did not allow growth beyond the level of the text regardless of the students progress. Many students memorized the material after constant repetition, and boredom sets in as a result. Some students in other departments do not have books at all; and in the home economics classes (sewing) male students are often there against their interests. Food stuffs provided for class consumption or use are not used and remain locked up or used by teachers or other persons. If the materials are intended for training purposes then the students should benefit from the use. In the case of the sewing classes, men could benefit from tailoring but they are a source of distraction in the regular sewing group.

Much time was spent reacting to the methods and attitude in the supervision of the caseworkers at Doolittle. In fact much of the trouble with lack of money is attributed to the supervision. It is thought that if the regulations were used at face value rather than being interpreted and arbitrarily applied, the financial load would be somewhat less of a problem .

It appears that supervision practices are constrictive, arbitrary and in most cases prevent students (recipients) from receiving the recommended amounts suggested by caseworkers. The attitude of supervisors appears vindictive, hostile and class-oriented. A recipient of public assistance is reminded that he cannot expect any better treatment than he's getting. Regardless of his personal ambitions he is relegated to a level above which he need not expect to rise. Students felt that the major problems in finance stem from this type of supervision. Caseworkers were given credit for trying to help the recipients. The administrator at the school was also given credit for having the interest of the students in mind.

Summary: The major categories and the priorities of problems in the categories were agreed upon as shown and summarized below:

FINANCE

1. Money received is inadequate for:
    - a. clothing for student and students' children
    - b. babysitter
    - c. student lunches

2. Checks do not arrive on time nor regularly

3. Cost of food stamps varies from one family to another having equal number of dependents.

SCHOOL FACILITIES AND SECURITY

1. Toilet facilities for male students are inadequate.

2. Water fountains are inadequate.

3. Health station and first aid not available in school.

4. Facilities for security of personal property not available.

5. Entry to school should be limited to authorized personnel only.

6. Classrooms are overcrowded when other space is available in the building.

TEACHERS AND SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

1. Some teachers do not always relate to students, i.e., level is too high.

2. Some teachers are not available for individual conferences.

3. Some teachers are not qualified in teaching methods.

4. Some teachers do not use materials available and on hand.

5. The school should admit students only after reviewing the students' eligibility.

6. Adequate counseling service should be provided to assist students in planning their programs.

CURRICULUM AND ACTIVITIES

1. Students are not reviewed on materials covered or assigned prior to the eighth weeks tests.

2. The Doolittle program should be organized similar to the regular high school program with opportunity for students to choose courses and subjects.

3. The program should lead to definite goals and objectives which are signified by a graduation ceremony upon completion of the program.

4. The length of courses should be increased from eight weeks to sixteen weeks.

5. The Doolittle program should include prevocational clerical training in addition to typing.

6. Students should practice test taking.

Materials, Supplies and Equipment

1. Provide books at the proper level of student achievement.

2. Provide all departments and students with books needed.

3. Provide latest or up-to-date equipment for familiarization and as training of students (example, electric as well as manual typewriters).

Socialworkers, Supervisors and their Relationship to Students

1. Decisions at supervisory level are arbitrary and final.

2. Students feel that some supervisory decisions are unfair, and in some cases, hostile to students and disrespectful in most instances.

CCDPA

I There appears to be a lack of agreement on the purposes of education at Doolittle School between the different agencies involved; i.e., CCDPA, WIN, CPS.

A. Problems related to instruction:
1. Teachers are not given special training for their work with adults. Assignments of teachers appear to be made without regard for the special qualifications needed to work with adult students. The evaluation of classroom instruction is not felt to be adequate and does not appear to be directed toward the improvement of the quality of instruction.

2. There is an apparent failure to excite, motivate, and interest the students in their educational program.

3. The curriculum is not flexible enough to allow for options in designing an individual program. The result of this is that the students are forced into courses which they may not want.

4. The general atmosphere is loose and permissive which results is not enough structure for students to be most productive.

B. Problems related to casework practices

1. There is a failure to provide training and direction for personnel by the agency and supervisory personnel.

2. Problems related to selection of caseworker staff.

   a. there is a lack of experience in working with the agency

   b. the sensitivity of the worker to the special problems of the adult student is not evaluated at the time of assignment to Doolittle.

   c. when experience in the agency and sensitivity to the clientel are lacking, more help is needed through supervision and training to bridge this gap

3. The size of the caseload is too high to effectively work with individual problems.

APPENDIX D

DOOLITTLE IN-SERVICE PROJECT REPORTS OF NOVEMBER 14 MEETING

Identification and Priority of Problems at the Doolittle School

Student Report
Group Leader--Thomas Brady

Problem:

1. Finance

   a. Money received is inadequate for babysitting, clothing for students and children of students, and student lunches.

   b. Checks arrive late and irregularly.

   c. Varying amounts of money are distributed for similar cases.

Proposed Solutions:

a. Reduce price of student lunches and other services where possible.

b. Assure equity in distribution and amount of money to aid recipients.

Problem:

2. School Facilities and School Security

   a. Toilet facilities and water fountains are inadequate.

   b. First aid station not available to school personnel

   c. Entry to building is not controlled and no facilities for protection of personal property are available.

Proposed Solutions:

a. Provide water coolers or fountains on all floors or centrally located sites.

b. Provide additional toilet facilities for male students.

c. Secure services of a nurse for first aid, treatment, or health consultation for school personnel.

d. Provide hall guards, badges, lock doors for entry or establish another system for control and protection of persons and property.

e. Reschedule classes to rooms large enough to accomodate students.

Problem:

3. Teachers and administration

a. Some teachers do not always relate to students, that is, the level of instruction is above students level of comprehension.

b. Some teachers do not use effective teaching methods.

c. Some teachers are not available for individual conferences.

d. Some teachers do not use materials on hand for instructional purposes and do not explain to students conditions dictating the use or lack of use of the materials.

e. Some students are permitted to attend school though they are unaware that they are ineligible to attend.

f. Counseling service for student guidance is inadequate.

Proposed Solutions:

a. Conduct or provide workshops for teachers to develop techniques of teaching and improve methods of relating to students.

b. Provide counseling service to students to preclude waste of students' time or misunderstanding of program offerings.

Problem:

4. Curriculum, learning activities, and student difficulties and behavior

a. The Doolittle program is not structured and graded as other school programs.

b. All courses at Doolittle are too short in length of time; some desired courses are not offered.

c. Students do not review materials covered as often as needed.

d. Students do not participate in graduation ceremonies.

e. Students are not provided practice in test-taking.

f. Some students are not consulted in the planning of their programs.

g. Some students disrupt class by talking too much, too loudly and intruding when class is in session.

h. Some students are disrespectful to teachers and other students.

Proposed Solutions:

a. Increase length of all courses from eight weeks to sixteen weeks.

b. Establish student evaluation periods to include weekly, monthly, mid-term and end of term evaluation and monthly progress reports or report cards.

c. Conduct a battery of tests to include diagnostic tests in all subjects, placement tests, aptitude tests, personality and interest inventories for counseling and placement purposes. Place students in programs and classes in accordance with test results and counseling periods.

d. Develop a hand book for students which will include a list of rules, regulations, and expectations of adult students. Disseminate the information to all students enrolled and those entering school, by posting on bulletin board, by orientation upon entry, and orientation during counseling periods or sessions.

e. Empower student council with authority to deal with disruptive or recalcitrant students or students who violate rules willfully.

Problem:

5. Materials, Supplies and Equipment

a. Books provided are not at the proper level of achievement.

b. Latest type of equipment not available to students for training

c. Toilet supplies are not adequate.

Proposed Solution:

a. Provide textbooks suited to the level of student achievement

b. Establish a system or procedure which prevents books from being taken from school, lost or otherwise causing a shortage of books.

Problem:

6. Caseworkers, supervisory personnel and student or client relationship

a. Decisions at supervisory level seem discretionary, arbitrary and final

b. Some decisions seem unfair and punitively oriented.

c. Students feel that attitude of supervisory personnel is sometimes not helpful.

Proposed Solution:

Review caseworker and supervisor-client relationship through refresher courses for all CCDPA and WIN personnel.

WIN Report
Group Leader--Eunice Neal Group Recorder--Holly Wicker

Problem:

1. Students are often not treated as adults because of the teaching methods and attitudes, and lack of student-teacher rapport at Doolittle.

Proposed Solution:

a. An outside agency should be hired to conduct an in-service training program for teachers at Doolittle. The program will include:

(1) a study of teacher attitudes (by a teacher-attitude assessment procedure)

(2) Sensitivity training sessions for teachers

(3) In-service training in Adult Education.

b. Periodically students should evaluate the teachers. This will be done anonymously by written forms and administered by a person from the University to insure that teachers can not retaliate against individual students and to insure the students freedom to write what he really feels.

Time: During the 6 month evaluation period the evaluations shall be administered at the beginning of solution implementation, around 3 months later, and at the end of the 6 months before the evaluation meeting.

Suggestions for procedure after May vary from every 4 weeks, every 8 weeks, to twice a year.

SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE:

Statements of teacher performances and characteristics will be listed, such as: (a) The teacher explains the material; (b) The teacher is helpful, etc., evaluated on a scale from very poor to excellent (very poor, poor, good, very good, excellent). Materials used in the course will also be evaluated on the same scale in the same form. There will be a space left at the bottom of the form for any further comments the students wish to make. The University will then share the results of the evaluations with the individual teachers involved, the students, the WIN personnel, the CCDPA personnel, and the Board of Education.

This is a suggestion for long term solution.

c. More teachers adequately trained specifically in adult education. Only teachers who can feel happy and proud to meet the responsibility and challenge of teaching adults should be retained. Teachers who are failures or dropouts in other spheres of education (for example - elementary, high school) should not be hired just because there are no positions for them within the educational sphere.

Problem:

2. There is a need for better communication between the four groups (WIN, CCDPA, teachers and students) about the procedures and resources of the separate agencies.

Proposed Solution:

a. It will be WIN's responsibility to hire 4 coaches to be stationed at Doolittle to do laison work between WIN & Doolittle. The suggestion was made that priority be given to former adult basic education students in hiring these coaches.

b. Doolittle School should establish a Post Office Box for itself so the WIN incentive checks can be delivered to the school rather than to the students' homes.

Problem:

3. Students do not have the freedom to choose to enroll in school, nor to choose their curriculum or goals.

Proposed Solution:

a. The state law requiring welfare recipients to enroll in educatonal programs should be challenged (both the state and federal laws on this matter should be investigated).

b. Each student should have the privilege of making his own specific educational plan and goal.

c. The caseworkers should be asked to remove the subtle pressures which force students to enroll.

d. The Doolittle program should be organized similar to the regular high school program wherein students change classes and teachers for different subjects. Students should be allowed to select those subjects in which he wishes to enroll. The program should lead to a definite goal with a graduation ceremony signifying completion of the program. Recognition of student achievement will enhance student self-esteem.

Problem:

4. The curriculum does not meet individual needs. It is set up for basic education, GED, and vocational training. GED material given in GED classes does not enable students to gain employment

when they leave the school. Basic education does not supply students' needs in continuing toward vocational or GED goals. Finally the school does not seem to be able to put sufficient emphasis or focus on any of these three programs (Basic Education, vocational training, GED).

Proposed Solution:

a. An ultimatum that either the pre-vocational program be made into a full scale vocational program which leads to employment or it be eliminated from the curriculum.

b. A reading expert should be hired to conduct a rapid reading program.

c. The curriculum will be divided into 2 major departments (1) Vocational (2) Basic Education and GED.

The GED - Basic Ed. Department should be divided into three levels:

1. 10th grade
2. GED
3. College prep

d. Additional avocational courses in special interest areas should be incorporated in the curriculum as electives for students enrolled in both departments.

Problem:

5. The referral procedure between Doolittle and WIN is not understood. Sometimes students are referred who have specific physical or emotional limitations to employment. When these students are accepted they are expected to meet demands of present day employment which do not, in many instances, take into account consideration of many of these limitations.

Special work projects (which are one of the priorities of the WIN program) would be helpful in this area, but at present these have not been developed on a large scale in Illinois. (There is uncertainty within the group as to the exact percentage of students at Doolittle who fall under this classification).

Proposed Solution:

a. Students at Doolittle now should be evaluated immediately to determine their achievement, their employability goal or lack of one, and their purpose in attending Doolittle.

b. Students who wish to withdraw from Doolittle should be allowed to do so without suffering any incuminating consequences.

c. Students remaining at Doolittle should receive assistance from the instructional personnel in establishing a realistic goal and a plan to achieve that goal, considering the Department (Vocational or Basic Education-GED) which will best meet their goal.

Problem:

6. There seems to be limited resources at Doolittle in that there are not enough books for each student and not enough vocational supplies, namely machinery.

Proposed Solution:

The coordinator of the School should reassess the supply of textbooks and vocational supplies and he should be sure that additional books and vocational supplies are provided.

CCDPA Report
Group Leader - Stephen A. Treffman   Group Recorder - Karin Dahl

Problem:

A.The main problem is that there appears to be a lack of agreement on the purposes of education at Doolittle School between the different groups involved in the project.

Proposed Solution:

a. A written clarification of the current purposes of education at Doolittle should be distributed to all personnel (teachers, CCDPA staff, and WIN staff) active at Doolittle. The clarification should be made as a result of meetings of the administrators at the highest levels of each agency: D. Lehmann, Mr. Herman, and Mrs. McCarthy. Is there one goal or a multiplicity of goals? What is the priority of the goals? What is the focus: vocational education or general education?

b. These above named administrators of the three agencies should meet with all Doolittle staff to discuss and further clarify the statement of purposes they have developed. In this meeting all professional and clerical personnel at Doolittle should be invited to participate.

c. In order to implement the clarified purposes and determine more effective ways of achieving them, in-service training should be increased.

1) Mr. Miller and Mr. Wilhelm should see to it that general in-service meetings to which all professional staff be invited be organized with representatives of organizations in the Chicago agency, and service experts, such as adult educational specialists, MSW s, psychiatrists, and psychologists brought in to conduct meetings on subjects of interest to staff. The meeting should be organized on a monthly basis on a regular day and hour basis. Assisting in the planning process should be a committee made up of one staff member of each of the professional groups at Doolittle, such members serving on, perhaps, a rotational basis. The meetings should be led by these two administrators, Mr. Wilhelm and Mr. Miller, perhaps also on a rotational basis. Teachers would be expected and required to remain in the school after 3:15 P.M. for such meetings

2) There should be a smaller meeting of one professional representative of each agency to discuss a selected instructional case, with discussion led by a skilled person or supervisor to give workers better understanding of problems of clients, new ideas about techniques, and clearer knowledge of varying perspectives of representatives of other agencies. Session should be coordinated on a semi-monthly basis by Mr. Wilhelm and Mr. Miller.

3) CCDPA staff meetings at Doolittle on a regular basis are vitally necessary and presently do not occur. Th- model for such a meeting might be as suggested in C2 above and would be administered and coordinated by the supervisor. These meetings should take place on a regular basis, possibly once a week, certainly once a week, certainly once every two weeks. Planning for these meetings would be accompanied by a whole-hearted interaction between caseworkers and supervisors, in which caseworker interests would be fully recognized.

d. The elaboration of these purposes might be made even more explicit, more understandable, if both the vocational counselors and caseworkers received a guide to the curriculum from Mr. Miller.

e. To implement the goals further among students, orientation programs should be developed for incoming students by Mr. Wilhelm and Mr. Miller.

1) Orientation about the educational aspect of Doolittle project with a clear statement of the purposes and detailed information about the curriculum and options within that curriculum which should be carried out by Mr. Miller assisted by the teachers.

2) Orientation about the social service segment of the Doolittle project with information about available services and procedures to be followed. All caseworkers, counselors, and supervisors could be introduced to the students and their functions explained with a stress placed on unity of purpose and interest in students' success. WIN staff might be included to provide information of their program.

3) Intermittently, throughout the year, assemblies for all the students might be held to reinforce purposes, present any new information, refresh memories, and further morale of students.

Problem:

B. There are problems related to instruction which detract from the effectiveness of the program at Doolittle: students are not excited, motivated, or interested because the caseworkers feel the teachers who are carrying out the educational program are not effective.

Problem:

1. The teachers as a group do not appear to be well trained in the teaching of adults and the selection procedure does not seem to require much in the way of such training prior to appointment.

Proposed Solution:

a. Teachers should be selected to teach at Doolittle only if they have had a university level course in Adult Education or, if teachers there wish to remain, they must complete this educational requirement. Such standards should be set by the Board of Education.

b. In the interim, the Board of Education, represented by Dr. Lehmann and Mr. Miller, should arrange short courses in adult education for all teachers at Doolittle and all teachers required to attend.

Problem:

2. The evaluation and control of classroom instruction is not felt to be adequate and does not appear to be directed toward improvement of the quality of instruction.

Proposed Solution:

a. Mr. Miller should make the effort to institute control procedures which indicate problems in teaching, and then work with teachers to solve problems which appear to exist or correct teaching practices which are not yielding positive results.

b. Mr. Miller should insist that teachers come on time to class and that they stay in their classrooms when they are supposed to be there.

Problem:

3. The curriculum is not flexible enough to allow for options in the design of an individual program. The students are finding themselves forced into courses which they may not want.

Proposed Solution:

a. The Board of Education should change the curriculum to make the shops elective. Individuals should be allowed to select which shops they want to attend and not get locked into one for a long period of time, cycle after cycle, because of deficiencies in their reading levels.

b. The Board of Education should extend the content of the Home Economics shop to include more than sewing techniques and should stress, in particular, information on nutrition. There should be some sensitivity in terms of placing students in shops where they may feel some contradiction between the skills taught and their concept of themselves: sewing is not a central concern nor is it necessarily congruent with the role model for males. Nevertheless they should be allowed the freedom of choice as to whether or not to learn these skills.

Problem:

4. The general tone at the school is loose and permissive with a resulting absence of structure and an atmosphere conducive to student productivity.

Proposed Solution:

a. Teachers should insist upon regular student attendance and should, themselves, provide exemplary role models

b. CCDPA should set minimum levels of attendance nessary for students receiving extra allowances; if a student's participation falls below this minimum level, the allowance should be immediately deleted.

Problem:

C. Problems related to casework:

Problem:

1. There is a failure to preovide training and direction of the personnel by the agency and supervisory personnel.

Proposed Solution:

a. There should be a much higher stress on training within CCDPA and at Doolittle. In addition to the programs suggested in the section entitled General Problem A, the supervising caseworker must consciously and conscientiously provide training and direction to each one of the caseworkers. Training should not be left to chance or the responsibility of the financial clerks. The caseworkers, too, should be more conscientious in reading their manuals and if they are not aware of how to use them or of other resources available to them, they should be made aware by the supervising caseworker.

Problem:

2. There are not enough professional staff and as a result the size of the caseloads is too high to effectively deal with client problems and those selected tend not to have had enough experience with agency or with problems of Doolittle's students.

Proposed Solutions:

a. Two additional caseworkers should be placed immediately in Doolittle.

b. The supervisor and other administrative personnel must act to reduce turnover rate, which was termed excessively high

c. Caseworkers selected for Doolittle should have sensitivity to the kinds of problems students at Doolittle have, should be interested in working at Doolittle, and have had more experiennce in the agency.

Problem:

3. There has not been an adequate follow-up of student dropouts.

Proposed Solution:

a. Vocational counselors should attempt to make more home visits

b. Addition of one more vocational counselor to spread the distribution of responsibilities, would greatly increase the time available to the counselors for such home visits.

Problem:

4. It is the opinion of the group that students occasionally may get the view that there is a lack of unity in purpose and action in what the CCDPA staff does at Doolittle and that this may lead to their sometimes believing that the caseworkers themselves are arbitrarily punitive. The group felt that Mr. Wilhelm may contribute to this problem by himself attempting to remedy grievances alleged by clients without consulting the caseworker involved or the caseworker's supervisor.

Proposed Solution:

The group recommended that whenever Mr. Wilhelm is confronted by a complaint made by a client about a casework decision, Mr. Wilhelm should refer the client back to the caseworker. He should further advise that if the client continues to feel that the caseworker has erred, he should speak with the supervisor about the problem. If the issue is brought by the client to the casework supervisor, the supervisor should clarify the policy for the client and, if necessary, for the caseworker. While the group agreed that Mr. Wilhelm should be the "court of last resort", they also felt that he should consult with both the caseworker involved and the worker's supervisor to determine whether the client had followed the appropriate grievance procedures. In the event that Mr. Wilhelm believes that the client is justified in his complaint, Mr. Wilhelm should discuss the complaint and its resolution with the caseworker and the supervisor in order that agency policy be clarified for all concerned.

Teacher Report
Group Leader - Dennis Day

Problem:

1. There is a lack of communication between the three agencies on a day to day basis, also in terms of the function and role of each agency and how it relates to the student. (Students and teachers are unclear of the function and role of WIN).

There is not enough in-service meetings between all agencies involved.

Proposed Solution:

a. There should be a meeting between all CCDPA Board of Educati personnel to form a general understanding of the exact functio roles, and responsibility of each agency. This meeting should be set up as soon as possible. A qualified representative from WIN, placed in the school office on a permanent basis for the following reasons:

(1) to explain in full the function of WIN as it relates to the problems of students and the other agencies.

(2) to clarify the expectations of students and WIN personnel for students entering the WIN program.

(3) to handle student problems and to answer questions in connection with WIN and its relationship to the entire effort at Doolittle.

After the meeting between the CCDPA and Board of Education personnel a subsequent meeting should be held to include a designated WIN representative. From henceforth each of the three agencies shall meet on some regularly scheduled basis to function coordinately and chiefly, to discuss problems, issues, and solutions for such as related to Doolittle,

b. Mr. Miller should serve as a liason between each of the three agencies, (Board of Education, C.C.D.P.A. and WIN) in matters regarding the personal treatment of students. The results of Mr. Miller's action and for mediation is to be fed-back to the students involved.

Problem:

2. Misguiding and misinformation is given to students before comi to Doolittle by those responsible for student recruitment. (Student expectation for programs and placement are too often lim by what the program can and does offer). Students receive incorrect information on prerequisites for referral, which cause confusion and some misunderstanding on how referrals are made.

Proposed Solution:

The provision for an open-house for all agencies so that everyone involved can see what the school has to offer. To eliminate the problem of students receiving misinformation about Doolittle, we suggest that a meeting between the three agencies should seek to set up standards, guide-lines for recruitment policies, program offerings, expectations and limitations as required by each agency or as decided upon unanimously by the agencies; this information could be compiled in guidebook form.

The guidebook would contain at least the following:

(1) information helpful to agencies responsibile for the recruitment of studnets.

(2) School objectives, curriculum, school policies and regulations. The goals and objectives and expectations for the students by the CCDPA and the responsibility and relation of WIN in the overall program also clarifying the role, responsibility and expectations of the Doolittle student.

Problem:

3. Too few vocational programs are available to the students after leaving Doolittle, or, at least, there is a lack of information and referral about them. (Many students are unable to find employment which is fitting to their vocational preparation). There is a lack of vocational, professional, guidance, testing and placement. (Students are too often unaware of their potential as well as of their limitations for a chosen career).

Proposed Solution:

The provision of more vocational programs to be geared to the needs and potentials of the students should be given urgent attention. The teacher will continue to relate to the student the value of wise choices of individual training programs, vocations and professions, teachers will encourage students to view their choices realistically, based on the student's own limitations or potential. Education, aptitude and experience in addition to the availability of such programs and professions are among the factors recommended for evaluation by teacher and student in making such choices. The reliance in part, upon guidance, testing and placement are essential to assisting students in identifying an appropriate career or training program.

Problem:

4. There are no provisions made for the training of students who seem unlikely to reach GED status. (Students who choose not to or are unlikely to obtain the GED are not being provided with other adequate training programs).

Proposed Solution:

The provision of a referral service for students who do not attain GED status. Information on training and jobs will be made readily accessible to students who meet this description.

Problem:

5. There is a lack of information on screening students with medical and emotional problems. A student may have interest in a vocation for which his/her physical condition may be incompatible. Further, there is a lack of dissemination of information on physical as well as emotional history or condition to the teachers (e.g., students often need glasses to see the blackboard; teachers are often unaware of these types of physical limitations).

Proposed Solution:

We as teachers should be given a copy of the medical history of each student who has a special or serious physical and/or emotional problem.

Problem:

6. There is a lack of immediate follow-up by the Department of Public Aid and counselors to document why students have been absent for a number of days.

Proposed Solution:

An inter-agency meeting will focus on setting a limit on the number of days allowed for absence for students. During this meeting someone from an appropriate agency will be assigned to follow-up on student absentism and to report their findings to other agencies involved to ascertain the incidence and reason(s) for absenteeism. We suggest that students who have valid reasons for recurrent absences be allowed re-admittance to Doolittle.

Problem:

7. There is not enough recognition of student achievements. Students are given little, if any, credit for their daily achievements and successes.

Proposed Solution:

To begin to solve the problem of not enough recognition of student achievements we urge the following:

a) Assemblies for student for the purposes of bestowing recognition for achievement, e.g., special services to the school or to the community or other unique contribution, these should take place at regular intervals.

b) Graduations should be offered based on the achievement at the eighth-grade, high school and GED levels.

Problem:

8. There is a lack of vocational shops causing students to repeat some shops many times.

Proposed Solution:

There is a desperate need for more pre-vocational shop areas to increase the interest of students while decreasing student boredom and teacher loads. (a) Each interested student ought to be exposed to a wide variety of areas, machinery, e.g., automatic adding machines, electric typewriters and other available machinery. (b) A cooking class will be added to meet the needs and interest of particularly our adult female enrollment. These measures will help to reduce the rate of student re-cycling through certain vocational areas.

Problem:

9. There is a shortage of equipment on shop areas.

Proposed Solution:

To determine the adequacy and condition of the equipment in shop areas a periodic evaluation and assessment of material and equipment for all shop areas will be conducted by a designated person or committee.

APPENDIX E

DOOLITTLE FAMILY EDUCATION CENTER
IN-SERVICE TRAINING PROJECT
PROGRESS REPORT

On December 5 four groups composed of representatives of the adult students, the teachers, the Cook County Department of Public Aid, and the Work Incentive Program met to review the priority listings of problems and solutions which had been prepared by the groups of representatives from each of the agencies and the students. The results of their efforts are recorded in the four enclosed group reports.

On Saturday morning, December 12, the entire group will reconvene at the Center for Continuing Education at 8:30 a.m. with three administrators present from each of the three agencies. Each of the group reports will be presented orally and members of the entire group will have the opportunity to ask questions to get an explanation of what is meant by any part of any report. Then an administrator from each of the agencies will comment briefly on the institutional constraints and resources which relate to each of the problems and proposed solutions. The administrators will not be asked to tell whether they like or dislike the listings, instead, they will be asked to talk about the practical limitations they see which may be unknown to or underestimated by the participants.

After the administrators have spoken the four groups which met on December 5 will meet again until 12:30 p.m. to consider whether they wish to make any changes in their problem listings or proposed solutions on the basis of what they learned from the reports of the other groups and from the additional information provided by the administrators. While the four groups are meeting the twelve administrators will also be meeting.

Lunch will be from 12:30 until 1:20 p.m.

At 1:30 the entire four groups will reconvene as one large group and spend the last 2 hours reaching agreement on the final problem and solution priority ordering. The results of this discussion will be used to guide individual, group, institutional and university efforts in program improvement efforts at Doolittle for the following six-month period.

NOTICE

Any participant who knows that he must arrive at the Conference late or must leave early because of conditions beyond his control should notify his group discussion leader, Miss Phyllis Cunningham or Mr. William Griffith so that the pay checks for the day's work can be adjusted accordingly.

GENERAL INDEX TO PROBLEMS IDENTIFIED BY FOUR DISCUSSION GROUPS ON DEC. 5, 1970

Doolittle Family Education Center
In-Service Training Project

The following index is provided to facilitate reference to the reports prepared by the four discussion groups who listed problems limiting the effectiveness of the adult education program at Doolittle and solutions to those problems in priority order. Each problem area identified by one or more groups is listed followed by reference to the corresponding group reports and problem numbers.

No order of priority is implied by the order in which the problem areas are listed.

Problem Area: Intra- and Inter-Agency Communication

Group Report	Problem Number
I	1
II	1
III	2, 6
IV	1

Problem Area: Purpose of Education at Doolittle

Group Report	Problem Number
III	1
IV	2

Problem Area: Curriculum

Group Report	Problem Number
II	3
III	3
IV	2

Problem Area: Student Recruitment

Group Report	Problem Number
I	3
II	2
III	4
IV	1

Problem Area: Student Counseling

Group Report	Problem Number
I	2
III	2, 4, 7

Problem Area: Teacher-Student Relations

Group Report	Problem Number
II	2
III	7
IV	4

Problem Area: Student Finances

Group Report	Problem Number
I	3
II	4
III	5
IV	3

Problem Area: Student Attendance

Group Report	Problem Number
I	2
III	5

Problem Area: Learning Environment

Group Report	Problem Number
II	5

REPORT OF GROUP I

Doolittle Family Education Center
In-Service Training Program
December 5, 1970

Problem 1: Inadequate inter- and intra-agency communication.

There seems to be a lack of effective communication among the three agencies involved - WIN, CCDPA, and the Board of Education - on a day to day basis. The personnel of each agency are uncertain as to the function and role of the other agencies. The students are uncertain of the functions of the three agencies and of the interrelationships among them.

This apparent inadequate communication leads to a duplication of efforts. There is a teacher, a caseworker, a vocational counselor, a WIN counselor and often a WIN coach involved in each individual student's case. The staff members of each agency are uncertain about the functions of the other agencies. The representatives of each agency do not communicate effectively with each other. Often the personnel from one agency do not know who to contact in the other agencies concerning a particular student problem. In most cases the WIN counselors and the CCDPA counselors are unaware of the type of information which each other has pertaining to the students. Under such circumstances it is not surprising that the students are unaware of the specific functions of all the different agencies involved in their education.

In the area of intra-agency communication there seems to be a lack of information about specific job responsibilities in relation to the other agencies between each supervisor and his subordinates. This situation may be the result of uncertainty of communication channels and responsibilities at the supervisory level. Unless individual supervisors have a clear idea of the most effective ways of dealing with student problems which involve the other agencies, the supervisors cannot clarify interagency relationships to their subordinates.

Solution for Problem 1.

1. Administrators of the three agencies, Mr. Miller, Mr. Wilhelm, and Mr. White, should each compose a statement of the functions of his agency in relation to the students. Each statement should include a description of all staff positions with the names and telephone numbers of the incumbents. These statements should be circulated to all personnel in all three agencies so that staff members will know who they should contact concerning any particular problem. This should be done immediately.

2. Group 1 believes that it would facilitate communication if the WIN administration could assign all Doolittle WIN students to one or two teams instead of having them distributed among all 16 WIN teams. The present basis used to assign students to WIN teams is not known by the members of this discussion group.

3. A permanent WIN liaison person should be stationed at Doolittle by the WIN administrator. This person should provide liaison with the students, the CCDPA and the Board of Education.

4. The group believes that the teacher, the CCDPA counselor, the WIN counselor, the caseworker, and the student should meet to discuss the student's case when a problem arises concerning the student's career goals and educational plans. The group feels that these consultations might be initiated by any of the parties concerned.

5. To facilitate communication between the WIN coach who visits Doolittle twice a month and other staff members and students, the principal of the school should make copies of the WIN coach's schedule of visits for the next month and make them available to the teachers, students, caseworkers, and counselors at Doolittle. The group felt that it would be desirable to have the WIN coach's schedule for visiting Doolittle six months in advance.

If students are absent on the day of the scheduled visit, the WIN coach could leave the paycards with the permanent WIN liaison, if one is established, or with the CCDPA counselors who could secure the signatures and return the signed cards by mail.

Problem 2: Poor student attendance

It was stated that student attendance was about 45 per cent of enrollment, The remaining 55 per cent, which includes some persons who have not been to school for several months, must be carried on the records until they are officially dropped from the program and a formal notice to this effect is received by the school. At times this action has taken as long as six months. The 45 per-cent of students in regular attendance constitute the pool from which WIN placements are drawn, from which GED students are graduated, and for which the program presumably exists.

Solutions for Problem 2

It was suggested that immediate open enrollment be considered as a means of providing a continuous intake and a sufficient backlog of students so that the number of students in attendance could be maintained at a given level. Maintaining an adequate number of students would permit flexibility in dropping procedures while taking optimal advantage of the staff and facilities at the Center. It was recognized that enrollment was not controlled entirely at the school level and that authority must be granted by the CCDPA and the Board of Education to implement a change in recruiting. It was urged that open enrollment be implemented as soon as possible and that authorization be sought from the Director of the CCDPA and the Assistant Superintendent of Schools in charge of education extension.

REPORT OF GROUP II

Doolittle Family Education Center
In-Service Training Program
December 5, 1970

Problem 1: There is inadequate communication among students, teachers, WIN and CCDPA about the procedures and resources of the three agencies.

Solutions for Problem 1:

1. The Doolittle Student Council should form a Change Committee with one half of the members drawn from the three agencies. The administrator of the school should be a member of this Committee. The first meeting should be held during the week of January 4, 1971. At the first meeting a schedule of regular meetings should be set. The conclusions and recommendations of this Committee should be distributed to all groups at Doolittle.

2. The WIN state coaching specialist should see that well-informed coaches are hired to be stationed at Doolittle to do liaison work between WIN and the groups at Doolittle. The suggestion was made that priority be given to successful ABE students in selecting people to be trained as coaches.

3. WIN and Doolittle administrators should get together during the first week in January to make the necessary arrangements so that WIN incentive checks will be delivered to the school rather than to the students' homes. Many students stay at home the day they expect their checks to arrive. Because the checks do not always arrive the day they are expected, students may miss several days of school because they feel they must be at home when the checks are delivered or the checks will be stolen.

Problem 2: Some teachers do not always relate well to some students and some students are not treated as adults because of the teaching methods and attitudes of some faculty members.

Solutions for Problem 2

1. Mr. Miller should provide the opportunity for a continuing in-service training program for the teachers at Doolittle. The following suggestions could be discussed at some of those meetings:

(a) A study of teacher attitudes (by a teacher attitude assessment procedure) to be followed by a discussion regarding the attitudes with individual teachers.

(b) Periodic student evaluation of the teachers. This should be done anonymously with written forms and administered by the educational research counselor at Doolittle to insure that teachers do not retaliate against individual students and to insure the students' freedom to write what they feel.

During the six-month experimental period the evaluations should be administered at the beginning of the solution implementation phase, about three months later, and again just prior to the evaluation meeting for the whole project in May. The procedure to be followed after the May meeting should be based upon experience with the project and the needs at the time.

The questionnaire should provide opportunity for the students to rate teacher performance and characteristics on a five point scale ranging from excellent to very poor. Materials used in each course would also be evaluated in a similar way. Students will also be free to add any unsolicited observations. These questionnaires should be summarized by the educational research counselor who will then share the findings for each teacher with that teacher as a means of facilitating improvement. Summaries of the evaluations should be shared with the students, the WIN personnel, the CCDPA representatives and the Board of Education personnel.

(c) More teachers should be hired who have been adequately trained academically or through experience directly in adult education. Only those teachers who are happy and proud to be teaching adults in the Doolittle program should be retained. Teachers who are unable to maintain student interest and to facilitate student learning should not be permitted to remain at Doolittle.

Problem 3: The curriculum is not flexible enough to allow for options in the design of an individual's program. The students report they are forced to take courses which they do not want and for which they see no need and are not permitted to elect other courses which they believe they would enjoy.

Solutions for Problem 3:

1. Adequate counseling should be provided to determine the goals and needs of the students at the time each student is enrolled at Doolittle.

2. Provisions should be made for a more flexible class schedule using departmentalization to facilitate the meeting of student needs. The courses should be set up so that the students will have the opportunity to make choices among those offered. This change should be made as soon as possible.

3. The Doolittle program should be organized like a high school so that students change classrooms and teachers for different subjects. Students should be allowed to select the courses in which he wishes to enroll. The programs should lead to definite goals with a graduation ceremony signifying completion. Student achievement should be recognized because in doing so the school fosters self-esteem and student motivation to learn.

4. Students who are preparing to take the GED examination should be given instruction in those areas in which they need help based on an assessment of achievement in each area. A student who is weak in only one area should be taught primarily in that area.

Problem 4: Group 2 believed that some mothers are taking their children out of the child development class because the mothers believe the children lack adequate clothing.

Solution for Problem 4:

1. The D.O. superviser of CCDPA at Doolittle should suggest to the central administration of CCDPA that Doolittle caseworkers be allowed to evaluate a trainee's request for additional clothing, and the caseworker is to submit the request to the CAO for approval of additional clothing allowances.

Problem 5: The group felt that the physical conditions of the Doolittle Family Education Center were not conducive to learning.

Solution for Problem 5:

Mr. Paul Rogers of the WIN group will explore possible ways of improving the physical environment through the use of volunteer services and contributed materials.

REPORT OF GROUP III

Doolittle Family Education Center
In-Service Training Program
December 5, 1970

Problem 1: There is a lack of agreement on the purposes of education at the Doolittle Center among personnel of the agencies servicing the Center.

Solution to Problem 1:

Dr. Lehmann, Mr. Herman and Mr. White should meet and attempt to clarify the purpose(s) of the educational program(s) offered at Doolittle. Some of the questions which they may wish to consider are: (a) Is there one goal or are there multiple goals? (b) If there are multiple goals, what priority order do they have? (c) Is general education, pre-vocational or vocational education the focus of the program?

Once the purposes have been clarified a joint statement on the purposes of education at Doolittle should be distributed in written form to all members of the agencies represented at Doolittle by the above named officials.

Problem 2: There is a lack of knowledge of the procedures and functions of the agencies and their representatives at Doolittle, among the representatives themselves and among the students. The result is that the agency representatives believe that they have not been able to assist the students as well as they might wish and the students feel that they have been unable to take full advantage of the services which are intended for them.

Solutions to Problem 2:

1. Meetings should be organized by Mr. Miller and Mr. Wilhelm in cooperation with a representative(s) from WIN in which all personnel from the Board of Education and the Cook County Department of Public Aid stationed at Doolittle would be invited.at these meetings, which should be held on a regular monthly basis to account for changes in personnel and in policies or procedures. The purposes of the Doolittle educational program would be discussed and the functions that each agency and its representatives attempt to carry out would be presented. The interrelationship of procedures and personnel would be stressed. A committee consisting of one representative from each of the three agencies would assist the coordinator of these meetings in the selection of topics to be covered.

2. An orientation program for students which allows the students to get a good general idea of what the program at Doolittle is all about, that is, its component parts and its purposes, and of what services are available at Doolittle should be developed by Mr. Wilhelm and Mr. Miller cooperatively. The expectations of the agencies for the students should be made clear. The program should be coordinated by one person on a regular basis and the steps of the program should be clearly outlined and made available to Doolittle's staff. The program might range in length from one half day to as

much as several days. Mr. Miller would introduce the educational component to the new students and Mr. Wilhelm would discuss the availability of casework services. The role of the vocational counselor might be brought out by Mr. Wilhelm or a vocational counselor. A representative from WIN would take part in the orientation program to explain WIN's role. A segment of the program would be given to representatives from the student council who would, out of the presence of the administrators or their representatives, discuss the program and their experiences in it with the new students. They would also provide the opportunity to present the kinds of things the student council can do for students while they are at Doolittle. At some point in the orientation process the legal obligation for attendance should be made clear to the new students. Their voluntary participation should be stressed and encouraged. Compulsion should be minimized. Students should meet their new caseworkers as soon as possible after the educational orientation. In the planning of this orientation program, the administrators and the coordinator of the program might consider the possibility of introducing the students to their caseworkers early in the process in order that any immediate financial problems be cleared up. Students who have successfully completed the program might be invited to attend to speak at the orientation sessions.

3. In-service training should be intensified for members of each agency. At the general all-staff meeting referred to above, specialists in fields related to the kinds of problems encountered at Doolittle might be invited to speak. The caseworkers might hold meetings twice a month led by their supervisor or Mr. Wilhelm in which explanations of the procedures and policies of CCDPA might be made and techniques for better implementation and standardization of these procedures would be discussed. Adult education specialists, specially qualified social workers both from within and outside the agency, psychologists, and psychiatrists might be brought in to conduct meetings on subjects of interest to staff. Dr. Lehmann and Mr. Miller should arrange for the development of short courses and meetings on a quarterly basis for the teachers in which educational problems would be discussed and coping techniques would be shared. Specialists would also be invited to these meetings.

4. The orientation of new personnel for all three agencies to the Doolittle Center should be of prime concern to the administrators of the program. It was suggested that a booklet outlining the functions and roles of the agencies be written by the administrators of the program or their representatives and be made available both to the new workers and to the older workers.

5. A representative from WIN might be placed permanently in Doolittle to serve as a liaison person in providing information about WIN to caseworkers, teachers, and students and to service any problems which students in the WIN program may have.

Problem 3: The curriculum appears to be inflexible in that students do not have the opportunity to select their programs and, in particular, to choose which shop they would like to be in or whether to participate in a shop.

Solution to Problem 3:

Participation in shops should be voluntary but students should be made aware of the potential benefits of the shops by their educational counselor, their caseworkers, and the vocational counselors, all of whom would have presumably learned of those benefits in the staff meetings discussed above.

Problem 4: The counseling services do not appear to be as effective as they might be with the possible consequence that students get unnecessarily frustrated.

Solutions to Problem 4:

1. The educational counselor from the Board of Education, a WIN counselor or coach, and the vocational counselors from the CCDPA should meet and seek improved ways of providing counseling that they and their fellow workers at Doolittle might utilize.

2. The caseworkers felt that they might be better able to provide ancillary services and counseling if their caseloads were lower. It was suggested that the two uncovered caseloads get workers to handle them. It was claimed that one caseworker is listed as being on the job at Doolittle but in reality is working at another office so that those who administer personnel may have the impression that there are four caseworkers at Doolittle when there are actually only three. The caseworkers also brought up the point that they estimated that one-third of their caseloads consisted of persons no longer at Doolittle. If these cases were transferred to another office, theycaseworkers would have more time to devote to the problems of these clients who are at Doolittle.

Problem 5: There are frequent delays in the delivery of WIN checks which appear to be caused by the students' absence from the school on the day the WIN worker with the paycard comes to the school. Though the student may otherwise be eligible for the allowance, there may be a backlog of two or three checks outstanding. The incentive, therefore which might be provided by that check may be diluted.

Solution to Problem 5:

A WIN worker should be placed at Doolittle full time or two or three days a week to service the WIN students regarding this problem.

Problem 6: The teachers felt that they were not getting adequate information on the problems that the students brought with them to Doolittle.

Solution to Problem 6:

Some type of referral form might be developed by the CCDPA that would give the teachers this information. The kind of information needed would be suggested by the Board of Education staff. This might be done on all cases or just on cases where some particular problems, physical or emotional, might impede the educational process. The teachers or caseworkers should confer on cases where problems seem to exist.

Problem 7: The students felt that they did not get enough information on their progress at Doolittle.

Solutions to Problem 7:

1. The teachers should try to provide more such information to the students.

2. The students should make better use of the counseling services at the school and should be encouraged to do so by teachers and caseworkers.

REPORT OF GROUP IV

Doolittle Family Education Center
In-Service Training Program
December 5, 1970

Problem 1: There is a lack of communication among the three agencies on a day to day basis in terms of the function and role of each agency and how it relates to the student. Misinformation is given to some students before they come to Doolittle by those responsible for student recruitment. (Student expectations for programs and placement are often unrealistic in terms of their situations and the program Doolittle can and does offer). Many students receive incorrect information on prerequisites for referral, which causes confusion and some misunderstanding on how referrals are made.

Solutions to Problem 1:

1. There should be a meeting among all CCDPA and Board of Education personnel at Doolittle, Mr. Miller and the administrators at the top level of each agency: Dr. Lehmann, Mr. Herman, and Mr. White, to form a general understanding of the exact functions, roles, and responsibility of each agency. This meeting should be set up as soon as possible. After the meeting, a qualified representative from WIN should be placed in the school office on a permanent basis for the following reasons:
    (a) to explain in full the function of WIN as it relates to the problems of students and the other agencies.
    (b) to clarify the expectations of students and WIN personnel for students entering the WIN program.
    (c) to handle student problems and to answer questions in connection with WIN and its relationship to the entire effort at Doolittle.

We suggest that each of the three agencies continue to meet on some regularly scheduled basis to discuss problems, issues and solutions in connection with the project in order to increase communication and to function on a coordinated basis.

2. Mr. Miller should serve as a liaison among the three agencies, (Board of Education, CCDPA and WIN) in matters regarding the personal treatment of students.

3. We suggest that the meeting among the three agencies should seek to set up standards, guidelines for recruitment policies, program offerings, expectations and limitations as required by each agency or as decided upon unanimously by the agencies; this information should be compiled in a guidebook. The guidebook would contain at least the following:
    (1) information helpful to agency personnel responsible for the recruitment of students.
    (2) school objectives, curriculum, school policies and regulations.
    (3) the objectives and expectations for the students by the CCDPA and the responsibility and relation of WIN in the overall program also clarification of the role, responsibility and expectations of the Doolittle student.
    (4) criteria for allocating financial aid and stipulations in connection with student and agency commitment to the project.

Problem 2: There appears to be a lack of agreement on the vocational orientation, objectives and curriculum for education at Doolittle among the three agencies involved in the project.

The curriculum does not meet individual needs. It seems to be designed for three programs: basic education, GED preparation, and prevocational training. GED material given in GED classes does not enable students to gain employment on leaving the school. Basic education does not meet the needs of the students who choose to continue toward vocational or GED goals. Finally, the school does not seem able to put sufficient emphasis or focus on any of these three programs.

There are no provisions made for the training of students who seem unlikely to reach GED status. (Students who choose not to or are unlikely to obtain the GED are not being provided with other appropriate training programs).

The curriculum is not flexible enoughtto allow for options in the design of an individual program. Some students are finding themselves forced into courses which they do not want.

Materials, supplies and equipment, in many cases, do not meet the needs of many students.

(a) Books provided are often not at the proper achievement level.
(b) Latest type of equipment is not available; e.g., automatic adding machines and electric typewriters.
(c) There seem to be limited resources at Doolittle in that there are not enough books for each student and too limited vocational supplies, particularly shop.

Solutions to Problem 2:

1. We suggest that the meeting among the three agencies should define the purpose of the educational and vocational orientation at Doolittle and specify the objectives of the different programs with a clear statement of the purposes and detailed information about the curriculum and its options.

2. The Board of Education should make the courses and shops elective. Individuals should be allowed to select which shops they want to attend to avoid involuntary re-cycling of students through courses and shops because of deficiencies in their reading levels.

3. More courses and prevocational shops should be provided to increase the interest and options of students while decreasing student boredom and teacher loads. Each interested student ought to be exposed to a wide variety of areas and machinery, e.g., automatic adding machines, electric typewriters, etc. A cooking class is suggested to meet the needs and interests of particularly our female enrollment at Doolittle.

4. The Board of Education should immediately reassess the supply of textbooks, supplementary materials and vocational supplies,e.g., automatic adding machines, electric typewriters and other machinery.

WIN and CCDPA should supervise the provision of books and other supplies.

Problem 3: Many students often report that money received for babysitting, clothing for students, children of students and for student lunches is critically inadequate. In addition, checks arrive late and irregularly.

Solution for Problem 3:

It was suggested that the aforementioned meeting among agencies attempt to resolve issues related to financial needs of students. A clear statement of the financial obligations of the project to the students should be included in the guidebook and rigorously enforced. The adequacy of student finances should also be reviewed for re-consideration.

Problem 4: Some students often feel that they are not treated as adults because of the teaching methods, attitudes of some teachers and students and due to a lack of student-teacher rapport at Doolittle.

Solution for Problem 4:

None offered.

APPENDIX F

DOOLITTLE FAMILY EDUCATION CENTER
IN-SERVICE TRAINING PROJECT

PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT FOCUS

The following is a listing of the problems which are now seen as limiting the effectiveness of the adult education program at the Doolittle Family Education Center and the solutions which have been proposed for solving them.

PROBLEM 1

There seems to be a lack of effective communication within and among the three agencies involved in the program at the Doolittle Family Education Center - WIN, CCDPA, and the Board of Education - on a day to day basis. This lack of effective communication is found at several administrative levels in all three agencies. There is a lack of knowledge of the procedures and the functions of the agencies and their representatives both among the representatives and among the adult students. The agency personnel are unsure of the functions and roles of the three agencies and of their interrelationships.

One result of this ineffective communication is that the agency representatives do not believe they have been able to assist the students as well as they might wish. The students feel that they have been unable to take full advantage of the services intended for them because of the confusion and lack of clarity of agency functions.

A second consequence of the inadequate communication is that misinformation is given to some students before they arrive at Doolittle by those who are recruiting students and referring them to the Center. The expectations of entering students are often unrealistically high in the light of their achievement levels and in terms of the educational program which is provided. Many students are also given incorrect information regarding prerequisites for referral which causes confusion and misunderstanding regarding the ways in which referrals are made.

A third consequence of the ineffective communication is a duplication of efforts. Often a teacher, a caseworker, a vocational counselor, a WIN counselor and a WIN coach will each be dealing with a single individual's case without realizing fully what other professional assistance is being supplied. Often the personnel in one agency do not know who to call in the other agencies regarding a particular student problem. In most cases the WIN counselors and the CCDPA counselors are unaware of the kinds of information each other has regarding a particular student. Under such circumstances it is not surprising that the students are unable to comprehend the specific functions of all of the agencies involved in their education. The teachers felt they were not being given adequate information on problems new students brought with them which might affect their educational achievement.

In the area of intra-agency communication there seems to be a lack of information about who is responsible within each agency for communication with personnel of the other agencies. It is not clear which administrative level in one agency may appropriately initiate cooperative activity with what administrative level in either of the other agencies. This situation may be the result of uncertainty of designation of communication channels and responsibilities at the supervisory level. Unless individual supervisors share a common view of the best way to deal with student problems using the resources of the other agencies, these supervisors cannot give leadership to their subordinates regarding inter-agency communication and cooperation.

Solutions to Problem 1

1. There should be a meeting as soon as possible involving CCDPA, Board of Education, WIN, and representatives of the adult students to develop a general understanding of the exact functions, roles, and responsibilities of each agency. In addition to the principal of the school and Mr. Wilhelm, the following persons should attend to be certain that the official position of each agency is accurately presented: Dr. H. Lehmann, Mr. H. Herman and Mr. A. White.

Following this meeting a qualified representative from WIN should be stationed in the Doolittle school office on a permanent basis for the following reasons:

(a) to explain in full the function of WIN as it relates to the problems of students and the other agencies.

(b) to clarify the expectations of students and WIN personnel for students entering the WIN program.

(c) to handle the problems of WIN students and to answer questions in connection with WIN and its relationship to the entire Doolittle program.

Representatives of the three agencies and of the students should continue to meet on a regularly scheduled basis to discuss problems, issues and solutions in connection with mutual efforts to improve the educational program. These meetings should serve to strengthen communication and joint efforts among the four groups.

2. At the meeting of the agency and student representatives, standard guidelines for recruitment policies, program offerings, expectations and limitations as perceived by each agency should be identified and compiled into a Doolittle Guidebook. This Guidebook should contain at least the following:

(a) information helpful to agency personnel responsible for the recruitment of students.

(b) school objectives, curriculum, policies and regulations.

(c) the objectives and expectations of the CCDPA for the students.

(d) a description of the role and responsibilities of WIN program personnel at Doolittle.

(e) a statement of the responsibilities and expectations of the Doolittle student.

(f) the criteria used in calculating financial aid and allowances.

(g) the commitments and stipulations of each agency regarding the Doolittle adult education program.

3. The chief administrators of the CCDPA and the Board of Education at Doolittle should develop an orientation program for students which enables the students to get a good general idea of what the program at Doolittle is all about, that is, its component parts and purposes, and the services available. The expectations of the agencies for the students should be made clear at this time. The orientation program should be coordinated by one person and conducted on a regular basis. The steps of the program should be outlined and made available to all agency personnel at Doolittle.

The orientation program might range in length from one-half to several days. The principal would introduce the educational component to the new students and Mr. Wilhelm would discuss the extent and the availability of casework services. The role of the vocational counselor could be explained by Mr. Wilhelm or a vocational counselor. A representative from WIN would take part in the orientation program to explain WIN's role.

A segment of the program would be given over to representatives of the student council who, without any administrator present, would discuss the program and their experience in it. The student council members would also explain the kinds of assistance students could expect to receive from the council.

At some point in the orientation program the legal obligation for attendance should be made clear to the new students. However, stress should be placed on voluntary participation and reference to compulsion should be minimized although it must be understood.

Students should meet their new caseworkers as soon as possible after the educational orientation. In the planning of this orientation program, the administrators and the coordinator of the program might consider introducing the students to their caseworkers early in the process in order that any immediate financial problems be cleared up.

Students who have successfully completed the educational program at Doolittle might be invited to speak at the orientation sessions.

4. Because of the turnover of the professional personnel of the three agencies serving Doolittle the orientation of new personnel should be a prime concern to the administrators of the program. The guidebook developed by the administrators to explain the functions of all three agencies should be given to all new employees and a special orientation session should be provided for them to go over the contents of the guidebook.

5. In service training should be intensified for members of each agency. At the general meeting of staff of all three agencies specialists in fields related to the kinds of problems encountered at Doolittle might be invited to speak. The caseworkers might hold meetings twice a month led by their supervisor or Mr. Wilhelm in which explanations of the procedures and policies of the CCDPA might be made and techniques for better implementation and standardization of these procedures would be discussed. Adult education specialists, specially qualified social workers both from within and outside the agency, psychologists, and psychiatrists might be brought in to conduct meetings on subjects of interest to the staff. Dr. Lehmann and the principal should arrange for the development of short courses and meetings on a quarterly basis for the teachers in which educational problems would be discussed and coping techniques would be shared.

6. Communication would probably be facilitated if the WIN administrators would assign all Doolittle WIN students to one or two teams instead of having them distributed among all sixteen teams. If this procedure cannot be followed, then it would be desirable to have one permanent Doolittle liaison person appointed in the WIN office to deal with all of the problems of Doolittle WIN students. (This is the same arrangement which is believed to have been developed for the WIN program at the Hilliard Center.)

PROBLEM 2

There is a lack of agreement on the purposes of education at the Doolittle Center among personnel of the agencies serving the Center.

There appears to be a lack of agreement on the vocational orientation, objectives, and curriculum for education at Doolittle among the three agencies involved in the project.

Because of this apparent lack of agreement on purposes among the representatives of the three agencies the adult students are understandably somewhat confused about their programs and the officially endorsed intended outcomes.

Solutions to Problem 2

Dr. Lehmann, Mr. Herman and Mr. White should meet and attempt to clarify the purpose(s) of the educational program(s) offered at Doolittle. Some of the questions they may wish to consider are the following:

(a) Does the educational program have a single goal or multiple goals?

(b) Are there discrete programs, each with its own goal?

(c) What is the priority ordering of the multiple goals?

(d) What is the central focus of the adult education program at Doolittle? Academic, general education, pre-vocational or vocational?

After the purposes have been clarified and placed in priority order, a joint written statement on the purposes of education at Doolittle should be distributed to all members of the agencies working at Doolittle and to the students as well.

The joint statement should specify the objectives of all of the programs offered at Doolittle and should clearly describe each curriculum and the options within it.

PROBLEM 3

The curriculum appears to be inflexible and not designed to serve individuals' educational needs. Students are not permitted to select their programs and to choose which shops, if any, they will take. The students report that in some cases they are taking courses which they do not want and for which they can see no need and at the same time they are not permitted to take courses and shops which interest them.

The curriculum seems to be designed to serve three different purposes: to provide training in basic education; to provide instruction to prepare students to take the GED examination; and to provide prevocational training. Students who are in the GED preparation program feel that they will lack entry level employment skills even after they have passed the GED tests. Students enrolled in the basic education program do not believe that in every case they are being aided in working toward vocational goals.

The assumption seems to be that all of the students at Doolittle will go through the basic education and GED preparation programs regardless of their career orientation. The validity of this assumption is questionable. Under the present arrangements a student who wishes to prepare for vocational employment but who does not want to work for a GED certificate is not being served by the program.

In a number of cases the materials, supplies and equipment do not serve the needs of the program.

(a) The supply of materials is limited in that in some classes there are not enough textbooks so that each student may have one. In other cases shop supplies appear to be unavailable.

(b) The textbooks used in some courses are reportedly of the wrong achievement level. Some students report being given the same book they have used previously in another class.

(c) The shops do not have modern equipment such as automatic adding machines and electric typewriters.

Solutions to Problem 3

1. Adequate counseling should be provided to determine the goals and needs of each student at the time he is enrolled.

2. Provisi ns should be made for a more flexible class schedule using departmentalization to facilitate the meeting of student needs. The courses should be set up so that, at the earliest possible date, the students will be given the opportunity to make choices among the courses offered which they are qualified to take.

3. The Doolittle program should be organized so that students change classrooms and teachers for different subjects just as is done in a conventional high school. The programs should lead to definite goals and there should be a graduation ceremony to recognize successful completion. Student achievement should be recognized because in doing so the school fosters the students' motivation to learn and increases their self esteem.

4. Students who are preparing to take the GED examination should be given instruction in those areas in which they need help based upon their performance on achievement tests. A student who is weak in only one area should be taught primarily in that area.

5. The Board of Education should make the courses and shops elective. Individuals should be allowed to select which shops they want to attend to avoid involuntary re-cycling of students through courses and shops because of deficiencies in their reading levels.

6. More courses and prevocational shops should be provided to increase the interest and options of students and to decrease student boredom and teacher loads. Each interested student ought to be exposed to a wide variety of areas and machinery. A cooking class in particular was suggested as one of the ways to meet the needs and interests of some of the women students.

7. The Board of Education should immediately reassess the supply of textbooks, supplementary materials, and vocational supplies.

8. An evaluation of the prevocational shops should be conducted by an outside agency.

9. The rate at which students go through the programs offered at Doolittle should be reviewed with special attention being given to the sutations of students who have been in the program for an extended period of time. Students of different ability should be allowed to move through the program at different rates of speed.

10. The addition of courses in art and music to the curriculum should be considered.

11. Special tutorial service for students who would welcome such assistance should be developed.

12. Students should be made aware of the potential benefits of participation in each shop by their educational counselor, their caseworkers, and their vocational counselors, all of whom would presumably have become acquainted with these benefits in their joint meetings with the Doolittle faculty.

PROBLEM 4

Many students often report that money received for baby-sitting, clothing for students and for the students' children, and for student lunches is critically inadequate.

In addition, checks arrive late and irregularly.

Solutions to Problem 4

A meeting should be held by representatives of all three agencies in an attempt to resolve issues related to the financial needs of students. A clear statement of the obligations of the agencies to the students should be included in a guidebook and rigorously enforced. The adequacy of student finances should also be reviewed for reconsideration.

Great care should be taken to make certain that all students who have the same needs receive the same assistance.

PROBLEM 5

Some students often feel that they are not treated as adults because of the teaching methods, attitudes of some teachers and students, and due to a lack of student-teacher rapport.

Solutions to Problem 5

The principal of the school should provide in-service training opportunities for teachers. These opportunities should be scheduled on a regular basis and would allow for the discussion of practical current problems and of teaching techniques.

The following suggestions could be discussed at some of the meetings:

(a) a study of teacher attitudes to be followed by a discussion of the findings.

(b) periodic student evaluation of the teachers. This should be done anonymously with written forms and administered by the educational research counselor at Doolittle to insure that teachers do not retaliate against individual students and to insure the students' freedom to write what they believe to be true.

(c) When teachers are hired a special effort should be made to identify those who have been adequately trained academically or through direct experience in adult education. Only those teachers who are happy and proud to be teaching adults at Doolittle should be retained. Teachers who are unable to maintain student interest and to facilitate student learning should not be permitted to remain at Doolittle.

During the five month experimental period the evaluations should be administered three times. First, at the beginning of the implementation phase; second, at the end of February or early March; and third, immediately prior to the evaluation meeting in May. The designation of a procedure to follow after the May meeting should be based on experience with the project and the needs at the time.

The questionnaire should provide the opportunity for the students to rate teacher performance and characteristics as well as books and other course materials. Students should also be invited to add any other observations. These questionnaires should be summarized by the educational research counselor who will then share the findings on each teacher with that teacher as a means of facilitating improvement. Summaries of the evaluations should be shared with the students, the WIN personnel, the CCDPA representatives and the Board of Education personnel.

PROBLEM 6

The counseling services do not appear to be as effective as they might be with the possible consequence that students get unnecessarily frustrated.

Solutions to Problem 6

1. The educational counselor from the Board of Education, the WIN counselor or coach, and the vocational counselors from the CCDPA should meet to seek improved ways of providing counseling that they and their fellow workers at Doolittle might implement.

2. The caseworkers felt that they might be better able to provide ancillary services and counseling if their case loads were lighter. It was urged that workers be assigned to handle the two uncovered case loads. The claim was advanced that one caseworker is listed as being on the job at Doolittle but in reality is working at another office so that those who administer personnel may have the mistaken impression that there are four caseworkers at Doolittle when there are actually only three. The caseworkers also brought up the point that they estimated one-third of their caseloads consisted of persons no longer attending Doolittle. If these cases were transferred to another office, then the case workers would have more time to devote to the clients who are at Doolittle.

3. Each student should be counseled when he first arrives at Doolittle so that any misunderstanding he may have about the school and its program can be identified and corrected. Further, at this initial interview an assessment should be made of the student's goals and needs and he should be given realistic advice about how long it would take him to reach different goals based on an examination of his achievement level at that point.

4. Some type of referral form should be developed jointly by the teachers, CCDPA, and WIN so that the teachers will be sure to receive information about any special problems new students may have which may impede their learning.

5. Teachers should make a special effort to see that students receive information on their progress regulary and frequently.

6. Students should take the initiative to make better use of the counseling resources at the school and the personnel of all three agencies should encourage them to do so.

PROBLEM 7

Because some students are absent on the day the WIN worker with the pay cards comes to the school these students experience long delays in receiving their checks. Though the student may be eligible for the allowance in all other aspects, because of absence on the day the WIN representative comes to the school, the student may have a backlog of two or three checks outstanding. The incentive value of the check is reduced accordingly.

Solutions to Problem 7

1. A WIN worker should be stationed at Doolittle full time or at least two or three days a week to service the WIN students and to provide information about the WIN program to students, teachers, and case workers.

2. To facilitate communication between the WIN coach who visits Doolittle twice a month and other staff members and students, the principal of the school should make copies of the WIN coach's schedule of visits for the coming month and make them available to the students, teachers, case workers, and counselors at Doolittle. The group felt that it would be desirable to have the WIN coach's schedule for visiting Doolittle six months in advance.

3. If students are absent on the day of the scheduled visit, the WIN coach could leave the paycards with the permanent WIN liaison, if one is appointed, or with the CCDPA counselors who could secure the signatures and return the signed cards by mail.

4. WIN and Doolittle administrators should get together during the first week in January to make the necessary arrangements so that the WIN incentive checks will be delivered to the school rather than to the students' homes. Many students stay at home the day they expect the check to arrive because they feel that if they are not at home when the checks are delivered, the checks will be stolen. (In a sense, then the WIN incentive check provides an incentive for the student to be absent from the educational program the day he expects the check to be delivered. And since the check often arrives one or two days later than the student expects it, the incentive to be absent presents a serious problem.)

APPENDIX G

DOOLITTLE FAMILY EDUCATION CENTER
EXPERIMENTAL IN-SERVICE TRAINING PROJECT

Report of May 22 Progress Review Meeting

On May 22 representatives of the students, teachers, Cook County Department of Public Aid, and the WIN program of the U.S. Department of Labor met at the University of Chicago Center for Continuing Education to evaluate the progress which had been made in implementing the solutions they had chosen for the problems they had identified in their meetings in November and December, 1970. Working in small groups in the morning and in one large group for the afternoon, the participants considered each of the following questions:

1. Which of the solutions proposed in the report of the December 12 meeting have been attempted and what have been the results?

2. Which of the solutions proposed in the report of the December 12 meeting have not been attempted and why?

3. In what ways has the operation of the Doolittle Family Education Center changed since December 12 as a result of the in-service project.

4. What are the three most important problems which are now limiting the effectiveness of the educational program at Doolittle? What should be done to solve them and who should do it?

This report is intended to serve as a record of the perceptions of the participants regarding these questions.

The afternoon meeting consisted of the presentation of a brief overview of the reports which had been prepared by the recorders in the small groups which had met in the morning. The following individuals served as a panel of reactors and responded both to the report and to questions and comments from the total group of participants:

Steven Bistransky
Martha Collins
Peter Grimes
Arthur White
Frank Wilhelm
Katie Wilson
Emma Woods

In presenting the report of the discussion, the remarks will be arranged in the same order as were the problems and solutions on the priority listing developed at the December 12 meeting.

PROBLEM 1

There seems to be a lack of effective communication within and among the three agencies involved in the program at the Doolittle Family Education Center-- WIN, CCDPA and the Board of Education -- on a day to day basis.

Recommended Solutions and Actions taken:

Solution 1: There should be a meeting as soon as possible involving CCDPA, Board of Education, WIN, and representatives of the adult students to develop a general understanding of the exact functions, roles, and responsibilities of each agency. In addition to the principal of the school and Mr. Wilhelm, the following persons should attend to be certain that the official position of each agency is accurately presented: Dr. H. Lehmann, Mr. H. Herman and Mr. A. White.

Representatives of the three agencies and of the students should continue to meet on a regularly scheduled basis to discuss problems, issues and solutions in connection with mutual efforts to improve the educational program. These meetings should serve to strengthen communication and joint efforts among the four groups.

Action:

With the exception of the small group composed exclusively of administrators all groups believed that no meeting of the administrative leaders of each agency had taken place.

In the group of administrators it was pointed out that Mr. Herbert Herman had called a meeting involving all three agencies but that no statement regarding their deliberations had been distributed to the personnel in any of the three agencies or to the students. Although Mr. White reported that WIN had been working closely with the Cook County Department of Public Aid (CCDPA) and that meetings had been arranged with Mr. Lehmann, no public release of information followed any of these meetings.

In the opinion of the participants, the administrative leaders had not held a meeting to develop a common understanding of the exact functions, roles, and responsibilities of each agency. If such meetings have occurred, no report of their conclusions has reached the personnel of the agencies who work at Doolittle.

Mr. White stated that a liaison person from the CCDPA is now working at the WIN headquarters. He also reported that under the new division of responsibilities the WIN basic adult education unit will work both at WIN headquarters and at the schools.

Students have not been involved in any joint meetings of the agencies. However, the Student Council extended invitations to Mr. Grimes and Mr. Wilhelm to attend their council meeting and both men attended.

A factor which has complicated the attempts to work cooperatively by representatives of all three agencies has been the changing of principals at Doolittle twice since the project began.

Several CCDPA staff members reported that even though meetings may have been held among the higher administrative levels of the agencies, they personally felt a lack of information concerning the WIN program.

Solution 2: At the meeting of the agency and student representatives, standard guidelines for recruitment policies, program offerings, expectations and limitations as perceived by each agency should be identified and compiled into a Doolittle Guidebook. This Guidebook should contain at least the following:

(a) information helpful to agency personnel responsible for the recruitment of students.

(b) school objectives, curriculum, policies and regulations.

(c) the objectives and expectations of the CCDPA for the students.

(d) a description of the role and responsibilities of WIN program personnel at Doolittle.

(e) a statement of the responsibilities and expectations of the Doolittle student.

(f) the criteria used in calculating financial aid and allowances.

(g) the commitments and stipulations of each agency regarding the Doolittle adult education program.

Action:

No guidebook has been developed yet, but a folder is now given to each new student telling him about attendance policies. WIN expects to have a booklet on hand soon which will describe the program in the State of Illinois.

Several participants commented that perhaps the reason no meeting was held and no guidebook as such was prepared is that no person was given the explicit responsibility of initiating the action and following through.

Solution 3: The chief administrators of the CCDPA and the Board of Education at Doolittle should develop an orientation program for students which enables the students to get a good general idea of the program at Doolittle. The expectations of the agencies for the students should be made clear at this time. The orientation program should be coordinated by one person and conducted on a regular basis. The steps of the program should be outlined and made available to all agency personnel at Doolittle.

The orientation program might range in length from one-half to several days. The principal would introduce the educational component to the new students and Mr. Wilhelm would discuss the extent and the availability of casework services. The role of the vocational counselor could be explained by Mr. Wilhelm or a vocational counselor. A representative from WIN would take part in the orientation program to explain WIN's role.

A segment of the program would be given over to representatives of the student council who, without any administrator present, would discuss the program and their experience in it. The student council members would also explain the kinds of assistance students could expect to receive from the council.

Students should meet their new caseworkers as soon as possible after the educational orientation. In the planning of this orientation program, the administrators and the coordinator of the program might consider introducing the students to their caseworkers early in the process in order that any immediate financial problems be cleared up.

Students who have successfully completed the educational program at Doolittle might be invited to speak at the orientation sessions.

Action:

The "already-existing" orientation program has been strengthened but mostly on an informal basis with various teachers taking responsibility for introducing new students to older ones, having older students guide the newer ones around the building, and by having informal coffee sessions. Members of the student council now are involved in the orientation program.

The members of one discussion group reported that both WIN and CCDPA representatives had been paying increased attention to acquainting the students with the fact that the educational program is voluntary rather than compulsory.

The students reported that the improved orientation program had been well received.

Some weaknesses were noted in the attendance accounting system as students in some cases sign in for a class and then turn right around and walk out of the room. In other cases the time reported by a student is not the time at which he signs the sheets. Although a record-keeping system exists it probably will require tighter controls if it is to become fully effective.

Solution 4: Because of the turnover of the professional personnel of the three agencies serving Doolittle the orientation of new personnel should be a prime concern to the administrators of the program. The guidebook developed by the administrators to explain the functions of all three agencies should be given to all new employees and a special orientation session should be provided for them to go over the contents of the guidebook.

Action:

No specific action has been taken regarding the implementation of this proposal. The participants felt that staff turnover is very slight. In the case of the CCDPA there has been only one new employee and he is a seasoned employee of the agency. Few of the WIN representatives at the meeting had ever been to Doolittle.

The packet of orientation materials which has been developed for incoming students could be made available to new professional staff.

Solution 5: In service training should be intensified for members of each agency. At the general meeting of staff of all three agencies specialists in fields related to the kinds of problems encountered at Doolittle might be invited to speak. The caseworkers might hold meetings twice a month led by their supervisor or Mr. Wilhelm in which explanations of the procedures and policies of the CCDPA might be made and techniques for better implementation and standardization of these procedures would be discussed. Adult education specialists, specially qualified social workers both from within and outside the agency, psychologists, and psychiatrists might be brought in to conduct meetings on subjects of interest to the teaching staff. Dr. Lehmann and the principal should arrange for the development of short courses and meetings on a quarterly basis for the teachers in which educational problems would be discussed and coping techniques would be shared.

Action:

In-service training meetings have been held separately for WIN personnel but they did not deal specifically with Doolittle. They emphasized the peer group concept.

Since December teachers have been meeting much more frequently for short sessions dealing with topics of immediate concern.

The CCDPA staff has come together many times, but the personnel did not feel that these meetings could legitimately be considered as training.

The student council has held one meeting since December and that meeting took place in May. Mrs. Pryor has been appointed by Mr. Grimes to serve as faculty advisor to the Council which now is regarded by the Board of Education as the community council for the school.

Publishers' representatives have met with teachers to describe their materials and to explain their use.

At a meeting of the teachers with Mr. Lehmann the possibility of setting up short courses was discussed but a decision on this was postponed.

WIN team members reported that not all WIN team members have been involved in the in-service training meetings held by that agency for its own personnel. The WIN training effort aimed at improving team work and increasing the effectiveness of group processes did not deal specifically with Doolittle.

Solution 6: Communication would probably be facilitated if the WIN administrators would assign all Doolittle WIN students to one or two teams instead of having them distributed among all sixteen teams. If this procedure cannot be followed, then it would be desirable to have one permanent Doolittle liaison person appointed in the WIN office to deal with all of the problems of Doolittle WIN students. (This is the same arrangement which is believed to have been developed for the WIN program at the Hilliard Center.)

Action:

Plans within WIN are to assign all WIN basic education students to one unit as a means of increasing effectiveness.

A WIN task force was sent to Doolittle to explain the WIN program to teachers, according to Mr. White. Some of the WIN team members attending the May 22 meeting were unaware that a WIN task force had been to Doolittle.

The fact that the WIN telephone number was unknown in the school administrative office was an indication of the amount of communication between the WIN office and the office of the Doolittle Family Education Center.

PROBLEM 2

There is a lack of agreement on the purposes of education at the Doolittle Family Education Center among the students and among the personnel of the three agencies serving the Center.

Recommended Solutions and Action taken:

Solution: Dr. Lehmann, Mr. Herman and Mr. White should meet and attempt to clarify the purpose(s) of the educational program(s) offered at Doolittle. Some of the questions they may wish to consider are the following:

(a) Does the educational program have a single goal or multiple goals?

(b) Are there discrete programs, each with its own goal?

(c) What is the priority ordering of the multiple goals?

(d) What is the central focus of the adult education program at Doolittle? Academic, general education, pre-vocational or vocational?

After the purposes have been clarified and placed in priority order, a joint written statement on the purposes of education at Doolittle should be distributed to all members of the agencies working at Doolittle and to the students as well.

The joing statement should specify the objectives of all of the programs offered at Doolittle and should clearly describe each curriculum and the options within it.

Action:

A Curriculum Guide for the Program of Adult Basic Education prepared by the Board of Education which spells out the goals of the program and identifies the responsibilities of the representatives of each agency has been presented by Mr. Grimes in one of the in-service meetings he had held with the Doolittle teachers.

The purpose of the Work Incentive Program (WIN) as interpreted by the Congress of the United States and the U.S. Department of Labor Manpower Administration is to "break the cycle of poverty for people on public assistance. Its long-range goal is restoring to economic independence all employable persons of 16 and over in AFDC families."

Accordingly, the WIN program has a single over-riding goal.

Because the multiple goals identified by the Board of Education also includes preparation for employment, it seemed clear to the administrative group that the single most important goal of the educational program at Doolittle is to prepare people for jobs. In fact, the WIN emphasis on meeting the training needs of potentially employable men before serving the educational needs of women is based on the assumption that preparation for employment among men is of the highest order of priority.

The other purposes of education at the Doolittle Family Education Center have not been placed in any official priority order.

No joint statement has been developed.

The Doolittle CCDPA administrative head has been invited to attend several in-service meetings of the teaching staff. No representative of WIN or of the students had been invited to the best of the knowledge of the participants.

PROBLEM 3

The curriculum appears to be inflexible and not designed to serve each individual's educational needs.

Recommended Solutions and Action Taken:

Solution 1: Adequate counseling should be provided to determine the goals and needs of each student at the time he is enrolled.

Action:

The student group felt that incoming students should be told, before they are officially enrolled, that GED students are not permitted to take typing, or, that the policy ought to be reexamined. Students also said that they felt the WIN program was only interested in getting a person a job as quickly and cheaply as possible without regard to his future opportunities.

Students appear to have been unaware of the two-year limit to the amount of time a person can be enrolled in training under the WIN program and so when they are dropped "without an explanation" they are surprised to find that this is the reason.

The students reported that the entering students now understand that anyone who is absent for ten days in one month without a good reason may be dropped from the program.

It was pointed out that with the number of professional CCDPA at the Center decreasing and the number of students increasing, it does not facilitate spending additional time with individual students. Further, rules of the program reportedly are changed and staff members are not notified, making the provision of accurate counseling difficult, if not impossible.

Entering students are reportedly given incomplete or inadequate information regarding their educational deficiencies and accordingly these students' expectations remain unreasonably high.

With the new input of students every two weeks program changes are being produced. Applicants are tested on a Wednesday and are enrolled the following Monday. Two new groups had been enrolled prior to May 22.

Solution 2: Provisons should be made for a more flexible class schedule using departmentalization to facilitate the meeting of student needs. The courses should be set up so that, at the earliest possible date, the students will be given the opportunity to make choices among the courses offered which they are qualified to take.

Action:

Students and teachers expressed satisfaction with the new division of teaching responsibilities in the GED program.

Students felt that teacher counseling in academic areas had improved under the new system.

A study period has been instituted which allows students to spend more time studying in their areas of greatest need and to get assistance from the appropriate teachers. However, it was felt by some participants that not all of the teachers regarded the study period as a time for providing individual instruction to students who seek it.

Solution 3: The Doolittle program should be organized so that students change classrooms and teachers for different subjects just as is done in a conventional high school. The programs should lead to definite goals and there should be a graduation ceremony to recognize successful completion. Student achievement should be recognized because in doing so the school fosters the students' motivation to learn and increases their self esteem.

Action:

Teachers who are teaching in the GED program have a departmentalized approach. Teachers of the less advanced students work somewhat in pairs.

Teachers of the elementary subjects may need to have sustained association with their students in order to be of greatest assistance.

The view was expressed that the individual teacher is the best counselor if he wishes to be because of his close contact with the students.

Mr. Lehmann announced that there would be a graduation ceremony this summer.

Solution 4: Students who are preparing to take the GED examination should be given instruction in those areas in which they need help based upon their performance on achievement tests. A student who is weak in only one area should be taught primarily in that area.

Action:

The development of beginning, intermediate and advanced GED classes together with more frequent testing is believed to make the instruction more appropriate to the needs of each student. In addition, the study period provides an opportunity for a student to secure assistance in whatever instructional area he selects.

Solution 5: The Board of Education should make the courses and shops elective. Individuals should be allowed to select which shops they want to attend to avoid involuntary re-cycling of students through courses and shops because of deficiencies in their reading levels.

Action:

Shops have been made optional and students can choose which of the two (typing and home arts) they prefer. The electric shop has been dropped.

The involuntary recycling of students through the shops has been essentially eliminated.

Although the courses are not elective, the instruction is being individualized to an increasing extent and even greater individualization will be possible after the learning laboratory has been installed.

Solution 6: More courses and prevocational shops should be provided to increase the interest and options of students and to decrease student boredom and teacher loads. Each interested student ought to be exposed to a wide variety of areas and machinery. A cooking class in particular was suggested as one of the ways to meet the needs and interests of some of the women students.

Action:

The number of shops was reduced by Mr. Murphy during his brief tenure as principal.

Additional equipment has been obtained for the typing and business machines class.

The home arts class may include cooking in the future, but, to date, it has not.

Continuing efforts will be required to adapt the curriculum to the needs of the students. As the number of male students increases, the kinds of shops offered will need to be modified, unless it can be assumed that the men would elect home economics and typing.

Solution 7: The Board of Education should immediately reassess the supply of textbooks, supplementary materials, and vocational supplies.

Action:

Additional textbooks, supplementary materials, typewriters and business machines have been received since December. There were some errors made in ordering, apparently, and it will take some time to exchange some of the material which is not needed for material in short supply.

Mr. Grimes has set up a display of instructional materials and has encouraged each teacher to request materials which will meet the needs of a specific class. The only limiting factor is that no teacher should be using a text that her students have used previously in another class at Doolittle.

Many additional requisitions for instructional materials have been submitted and are now being processed. Supplies which had been ordered by Mr. Miller arrived after he left and there seems to be no reason to believe that the amount of time required to have an order filled is likely to decrease. Temporarily, at any rate, some shortage continued to exist as of May 22.

Solution 8: An evaluation of the prevocational shops should be conducted by an outside agency.

Action:

The prevocational shops appeared to be primarily a remnant of the Manpower 3000 project which was the first adult education program at Doolittle. Although no formal evaluation was undertaken by an outside or an inside agency, the shops with the exception of typing and home arts were eliminated by Mr. Murphy.

Solution 9: The rate at which students go through the programs offered at Doolittle should be reviewed with special attention being given to the situations of students who have been in the program for an extended period of time. Students of different ability should be allowed to move through the program at different rates of speed.

Action:

The frequency of testing has been increased thereby making it possible for students to move through the program more rapidly, if they are ready.

No WIN student can be supported in that program for a period of more than two years.

Public Aid students may still remain in the program for apparently an unlimited time so long as they maintain satisfactory attendance.

The visit of the WIN task force to Doolittle was perceived as giving an increased emphasis to the development of realistic individual employment plans and has led to increased follow up of students on that dimension.

Weekly testing now makes it possible for a student to progress to another class as soon as he is ready.

Solution 10: The addition of courses in art and music to the curriculum should be considered.

Action:

The addition of courses in art and music appears to be impractical at this time due to other more pressing needs. However, the home arts shop may include some work in art according to student interest and to the extent permitted by competing curricular needs.

Several persons pointed out that if a program is tailor made to suit the specific needs and interests of one group, then if the nature of that group changes the educational program should change also to reflect the new needs and interests.

Solution 11: Special tutorial service for students who would welcome such assistance should be developed.

Action:

Tutorial assistance for students is available from the regular faculty during the study period.

No arrangements have been attempted as yet to develop a system to utilize tutors who are not a part of the school system.

Solution 12: Students should be made aware of the potential benefits of participation in each shop by their educational counselor, their caseworkers, and their vocational counselors, all of whom would presumably have become acquainted with these benefits in their joint meetings with the Doolittle faculty.

Action:

The principal stated that he had reminded the teachers of the benefits students can derive from participating in the shops.

No meeting has been held with CCDPA or WIN staff members to acquaint them with the learning opportunities provided by the typing and home arts classes. Accordingly they are not sufficiently well informed regarding the shops to be able to explain all of their advantages to their clients.

PROBLEM 4

Many students report that the amount of money provided for babysitting costs for purchase of clothing for the students and their children, and for buying student lunches is critically inadequate. In addition, the checks arrive late and irregularly.

Recommended Solutions and Action Taken

Solution 1: A meeting should be held by representatives of all three agencies in an attempt to resolve issues related to the financial needs of students. A clear statement of the obligations of the agencies to the students should be included in a guidebook and rigorously enforced. The adequacy of student finances should also be reviewed for reconsideration. Great care should be taken to make certain that all students who have the same needs receive the same assistance.

Action:

The administrators of the three agencies agreed unanimously that the students at Doolittle are now receiving all of the financial support now permitted under the existing State and National legislation and guidelines.

Changes in this area are not likely to come about as a result of suggestions made by local agency personnel. Instead, changes are most likely to occur only as a result of legislative action.

Everyone agreed that it would be desirable for the students to receive larger allotments but those present at the meeting must abide by the State regulations.

The WIN representatives reported that the process of issuing checks has been accelerated. Further, the method of distribution may be modified in July when a WIN representative is spending two or three days a week at Doolittle.

PROBLEM 5

Some students often feel that they are not treated as adults because of the teaching methods used, the attitudes of some teachers and students, and a lack of teacher-student rapport.

Recommended Solutions and Action Taken:

Solution 1: The principal of the school should provide in-service training opportunities for teachers. These opportunities should be scheduled on a regular basis and would allow for the discussion of practical current problems and of teaching techniques.

The following suggestions could be discussed at some of the meetings:

(a) a study of teacher attitudes to be followed by a discussion of the findings.

(b) periodic student evaluation of the teachers. This should be done anonymously with written forms and administered by the educational research counselor at Doolittle to insure that teachers do not retaliate against individual students and to insure the students' freedom to write what they believe to be true.

(c) When teachers are hired a special effort should be made to identify those who have been adequately trained academically or through direct experience in adult education. Only those teachers who are happy and proud to be teaching adults at Doolittle should be retained. Teachers who are unable to maintain student interest and to facilitate student learning should not be permitted to remain at Doolittle.

During the five month experimental period the evaluations should be administered three times. First, at the beginning of the implementation phase; second, at the end of February or early March; and third, immediately prior to the evaluation meeting in May. The designation of a procedure to follow after the May meeting should be based on experience with the project and the needs at the time.

The questionnaire should provide the opportunity for the students to rate teacher performance and characteristics as well as books and other course materials. Students should also be invited to add any other observations. These questionnaires should be summarized by the educational research counselor who will then share the findings on each teacher with that teacher as a means of facilitating improvement. Summaries of the evaluations should be shared with the students, the WIN personnel, the CCDPA representatives and the Board of Education personnel.

Action:

No action has been taken on the suggestion that a formal evaluation procedure be developed to enable students to express their views on the adequacy, strengths, and weaknesses of the instructors.

Increased opportunities for teacher interaction have been primarily directed toward enlarging the teachers' knowledge of curriculum materials available and toward providing the teachers with the freedom to select instructional materials which they prefer to use.

One administrator observed that the teachers now seem a bit more concerned about the students' views on the adequacy and suitability of the curricular materials.

One group of participants felt that the new students coming into the program differed from the older students in that the newer students appeared to have stronger academic backgrounds and seemed to find it easier to relate to the teachers.

Resentment was reported regarding the continuing tendency of some teachers to show little or no respect for their adult students. Several students reportedly had been called "dummies" by a teacher, an act which they resented. Another student felt she had been ridiculed because of certain remarks a teacher had made about the student's attire. The students felt that when a student believes he has been treated thoughtlessly or in a demeaning manner by a teacher, that student should first express his concern to the teacher involved and if no improvement results, the student should then take his concern to the student council.

With regard to the matter of recruiting teachers with special expertise in adult education, one group reported that probably little could be done "because teachers are assigned to schools from a list of the Board of Education and apparently adult school administrators have no power in that process."

Particular attention will be required to make certain that the teacher in the learning lab is conducting that facility as a way of supporting the existing program. Some limited testimony concerning learning laboratories at other locations suggest that there is a tendency for the learning lab to be operated almost as a completely separate educational institution and that care must be taken to avoid having that happen at Doolittle.

Because the Student Council was just being developed by Mr. Miller before he left Doolittle, his departure left the Council members confused regarding their role. The Council was not convened by Mr. Murphy when he served as principal. Mrs. Pryor has been appointed by Mr. Grimes to serve as advisor to the Council and meetings have resumed.

PROBLEM 6

The counseling services do not appear to be as effective as they might be with the possible consequence that students become frustrated unnecessarily.

Recommended Solutions and Action Taken:

Solution 1: The educational counselor from the Board of Education, the WIN counselor or coach, and the vocational counselors from the CCDPA should meet to seek improved ways of providing counseling that they and their fellow workers at Doolittle might implement.

Action:

Mr. Wilhelm reported that one "case conference" had been held involving persons in addition to CCDPA staff. However, he said that this did not constitute a change from existing practices.

Teachers and CCDPA personnel reported that they had been developing closer working relationships since December and that these appeared to grow out of an increased willingness on the part of the members of each group to seek out persons from the other agency.

All WIN students at Doolittle have visited the downtown office of WIN since December at the invitation of the agency.

Solution 2: The caseworkers felt that they might be better able to provide ancillary services and counseling if their case loads were lighter. It was urged that workers be assigned to handle the two uncovered case loads. The claim was advanced that one caseworker is listed as being on the job at Doolittle but in reality is working at another office so that those who administer personnel may have the mistaken impression that there are four caseworkers at Doolittle when there are actually only three. The caseworkers also brought up the point that they estimated one-third of their caseloads consisted of persons no longer attending Doolittle. If these cases were transferred to another office, then the case workers would have more time to devote to the clients who are at Doolittle.

Action:

Mr. Wilhelm reported that he and Mr. Brown had been concentrating on bringing all of the student records up to date and dropping students who were not attending regularly. Requests have been sent to the CCDPA headquarters for additional staff but the staff shortage is common across the agency and the personnel must be equitably assigned to all offices.

The Doolittle caseworker who had been assigned to the Hilliard Center has not yet been replaced. Additional staff reductions are anticipated.

Solution 3: Each student should be counseled when he first arrives at Doolittle so that any misunderstanding he may have about the school and its program can be identified and corrected. Further, at this initial interview an assessment should be made of the student's goals and needs and he should be given realistic advice about how long it would take him to reach different goals based on an examination of his achievement level at that point.

Action:

Students are still showing up for GED preparation who are not ready for that level.

A feeder class or beginning class to meet the special needs which arose out of the more liberal enrollment policy makes it possible to give more personal attention to teach student's academic strengths and weaknesses.

The improved, expanded orientation program is intended to help to alleviate this problem of unrealistic expectations which are often followed by discouragement and dropping out of the program.

Solution 4: Some type of referral form should be developed jointly by the teachers, CCDPA, and WIN so that the teachers will be sure to receive information about any special problems new students may have which may impeded their learning.

Action:

The general reaction of the administrative group was that additional forms would probably cost more than they would contribute. Instead of creating new forms, the administrators suggested that the staff might make better use of the existing forms. Improved communication between agencies might improve the flow of information and some persons believe that this is already occurring.

Too much dependence on forms may lead to an impairment rather than an improvement in communication between and among the agencies and the students.

Solution 5: Teachers should make a special effort to see that students receive information on their progress regularly and frequently.

Action:

In some areas the frequency of testing has been increased but no across-the-board change was reported. Some concern was expressed over the possibly unnecessary testing conducted by WIN over and above the regular testing at the school.

Solution 6: Students should take the initiative to make better use of the counseling resources at the school and the personnel of all three agencies should encourage them to do so.

Action:

Students reported that they have to wait so long at a caseworker's door to talk with the caseworker because of the large number of students taking advantage of this resource that students tend to get discouraged. The students felt that there were not enough CCDPA staff to take care of the students' needs adequately in a reasonable period of time.

From the standpoint of the administrators' group no change in student initiative had been noted.

The Student Council planned to meet with Mr. Wilhelm to discuss car fare distribution policies as a way of clearing up the confusion of students regarding the present method of administering the policies.

PROBLEM 7

Because some WIN students are absent on the day the WIN worker with the pay cards comes to the school, these students experience long delays in receiving their checks.

Recommended Solutions and Action Taken

Solution 1: A WIN worker should be stationed at Doolittle full time or at lest two or three days a week to service the WIN students and to provide information about the WIN program to students, teachers, and case workers.

Action:

Beginning July 1 a WIN worker will spend two or three days each week at the Doolittle Family Education Center.

Also the Doolittle WIN students will be assigned to probably no more than two teams in the near future.

Solution 2: To facilitate communication between the WIN coach who visits Doolittle twice a month and other staff members and students, the principal of the school should make copies of the WIN coach's schedule of visits for the coming month and make them available to the students, teachers, case workers, and counselors at Doolittle. The group felt that it would be desirable to have the WIN coach's schedule for visitng Doolittle six months in advance.

Action:

The administrators felt that this solution had been implemented. However, despite the best efforts of the WIN representatives, the principal, and the members of the student council to disseminate this information on the WIN coach's schedule of visits, some students never seem to get the word and so when the WIN coach comes to Doolittle she sometimes does not see WIN students who are present that day.

The schedule is available where students register their daily attendance. Some students come into the office only once a day and register both the time of arrival and the time of departure during that single visit.

Whoever is appointed to represent WIN at Doolittle must know enough about the agency so he can discuss it and its latest rules, regulations, policies, and interpretations with teachers, students, and CCDPA personnel. If the WIN representative is not well informed by his own agency he will add to any existing confusion.

The WIN staff members had the impression that the schedule of the WIN liaison worker had not been adequately publicized at Doolittle because some of the WIN students say that they still don't know when she will be there.

Solution 3: If students are absent on the day of the scheduled visit, the WIN coach could leave the paycards with the permanent WIN liaison, if one is appointed, or with the CCDPA counselors who could secure the signatures and return the signed cards by mail.

Action:

Mr. Wilhelm stated that he would seek authorization to implement this solution but that it would only be possible to do it for a small number of people. Mr. White noted that this procedure would not be needed after the WIN program has assigned a representative to work 2 or 3 days each week at Doolittle.

When the pay cards are not ready for Mrs. Woods, it is now the responsibility of members of the teams to get them signed. Students no longer need to go to the WIN office for this purpose.

Solution 4: WIN and Doolittle administrators should get together during the first week in January to make the necessary arrangements so that the WIN incentive checks will be delivered to the school rather than to the students' homes. Many students stay at home the day they expect the check to arrive because they feel that if they are not at home when the checks are delivered, the checks will be stolen. (In a sense, then the WIN incentive check provides an incentive for the student to be absent from the educational program the day he expects the check to be delivered. And since the check often arrives one or two days later than the student expects it, the incentive to be absent presents a serious problem.)

Action:

Mr. White said that the checks would be delivered to Doolittle by the WIN representative who is expected to be spending two or three days each week at Doolittle effective July 1.

Additional Issues in Dispute

The following items were identified as possible causes of impaired efficiency at the Doolittle Family Education Center:

1. Confusion about the policy on car fare. - The results of the student council meeting with Mr. Wilhelm should be communicated to every student to reduce the likelihood of misunderstandings.

2. Confusion or disagreement about the adequacy of the luncheon allowance. Students need to know what choices are available and should be given all of the facts directly instead of having to depend on second hand and third hand reports from individuals who themselves may have been misinformed.

3. The testing required by WIN seems not to consider the testing routinely performed within the school. Increased cooperation and coordination is needed to improve the testing program in the best interests of all students, teachers, and agencies. Too much testing can be as bad as too little.

4. For the sake of the program, it seems that increased communication is needed among the administrative leaders of all three agencies directly involved in Doolittle. WIN is still clearly seen by most participants as an unknown outside force with an unclear mission operating with a concealed set of rules by people who may not spend enough time at Doolittle to know what is going on there. The effectiveness of the WIN progam at Doolittle might be increased if WIN personnel spent enough time at the school to become familiar with the staff and the existing programs.

5. There is still no regular meeting at Doolittle for representatives of all four groups to discuss matters of common concern. Perhaps Mr. Grimes is the most appropriate person to initiate such regular meetings of representatives of the students, teachers, CCDPA and WIN.

6. The existing shops are not seen as potentially attractive to the increasing number of men students.

7. Some confusion and hostility was expressed regarding the manner in which efforts were being made to influence the students' choice of clothing. Items of apparel such as "hot pants" were of some concern concern and it seemed necessary to arrive at a uniform policy for the school which could be endorsed by students as well.

8. Student attendance continues to be somewhat of a problem. Not only is there the difficulty of student absence from the Doolittle Family Education Center, but also there is the problem of students who are present in the building but who are cutting classes.

9. WIN representatives seemed not to be up to date on the changes at Doolittle which were reported by the teachers, students and CCDPA personnel and therefore they cited faults in the program which had been corrected or for which improvements had been worked out. WIN representatives were not all acquainted with the new practice of enrolling new students every two weeks as a modified open enrollment procedure. Improved means of getting information to WIN representatives from the policy makers in the agency may be needed.

10. Although it was generally conceded that officially preparation for employment is the major purpose of the WIN program and is one of the major purposes identified by the Chicago Board of Education for the basic education classes it conducts, a number of the participants continue to believe that other purposes are at least as valid as preparation for employment. That is to say, some of the staff members in the three agencies are not ready to accept the officially designated purpose as the most important purpose in fact.

11. One student expressed the viewpoint that a security guard was needed within the school partly because of the changing composition of the student body. This topic was not discussed after it had been introduced.

12. A number of participants commented that the major changes in the system appeared to have occurred not as a result of any taking of initiative on the part of those involved in the in-service training project. Instead major personnel and policy changes were the result of administrative decisions made by agency officers who were not part of the training group.

13. The lack of a policy guidebook and the absence of any regularized system for communicating agency changes within and among agencies tends to encourage the development and circulation of rumors.

Future Plans

A preliminary statistical report developed by Miss Phyllis Cunningham and Mrs. Ann Fales was distributed toward the close of the May 22 meeting. A final oral report will be made at a meeting of all day center professional staff at the Doolittle Family Education Center on Friday, July 16, when the implications of this project for the other day centers will be discussed.

This progress report may appear to be more negative than positive because it was written to identify those areas in which more effort would be required for success. The considerable accomplishments have not all been identified. In the final report as much attention will be directed toward the identification of progress which has been made as to the identification of areas in which aspirations and expectations exceeded our ability to perform.

Copies of the detailed final written report will be distributed to all three cooperating agencies and to the Student Council.

APPENDIX H

THE DOOLITTLE TASK FORCE SURVEY

DATES: February 8 - 12, 1971

TASK FORCE: WIN Employees, Cook County

PURPOSE OF THE SURVEY: The survey was conducted in order to collect data on WIN students attending the Doolittle Adult Basic Education Center, the ultimate goal being an individual assessment of the students in order to facilitate the development of a more realistic employability plan for the students; also to assess those referrals which were inappropriate at the time they were referred by the CCDPA in order to maintain service to these clients. The clients which were determined to be inappropriate for WIN would continue to be serviced by the CCDPA.

DATA: The data collected represents seventy-seven (77) of a total of one hundred nine (109) students who were interviewed by the WIN staff. It reflects information from the CCDPA and the school staff (teachers and caseworkers).

AGE FACTORS: Mean age - 32.7 yrs.
Age cagetories:
15 to 20 yrs. - 8 students
21 to 30 yrs. -28 students
31 to 40 yrs. -21 students
over 40 yrs. -20 students
There were four (4) students over fifty (50) yrs. of age.

CHILDREN: The 77 students accounted for 260 children. Two students had no children.

Categories:
15 students reported having one child.
15 students reported having two children.
15 students reported having three children.
10 students reported having four children.
10 students reported having five children.
4 students reported having six children.
6 students reported having in excess of six children.

Child Care Arrangements

Use Doolittle School - 4 students
Hire own sitter -34 students
Children attend school - 34 students
Attend Doolittle - 3 students
Two students have no children.

GRADE COMPLETED PRIOR TO ENTERING DOOLITTLE

Under 8th grade - 16 students
Eighth grade - 16 students
Ninth grade - 7 students
Tenth grade - 18 students
Eleventh grade - 13 students
High school graduate 5 students
Two students - no available information.

HAD TRAINING PRIOR TO DOOLITTLE

Yes - 20 students
No - 57 students
This was some form of training after dropping out of regular school.

SOURCE OF REFERRALS

WIN referred - 6 students
CCDPA referred - 67 students
Unknown source - 4 students

LENGTH OF TIME IN WIN

Less than two months - 7 students.
Two to six months -28 students.
Seven to twelve months - 31 students.
Over one year - 7 students.
Two years - 2 students.
Unknown - 2 students.

LENGTH OF TIME AT DOOLITTLE

One month or less - 5 students
Two to six months -24 students
Seven to twelve mos.-19 students
Over one year - 9 students
Over two years -20 students.

GENERAL DATA

Number terminated since task force survey - 27
Number attending specifically for GED - 20
Number to raise reading & math scores - 14
Number who expressed having a particular goal - 16
Those terminated from WIN continue to attend under CCDPA.

EMPLOYABILITY PLAN BEFORE TASK FORCE SURVEY

Before the Task Force visited Doolittle school, almost none of those participating at the institution in the WIN program had any definite employability plan developed for them, even though WIN guidelines require such plans.
Thirteen were decided.
Sixty-four had no plans.

FOLLOWING THE TASK FORCE.

Only fifteen new employability plans were developed.
Forty-six were still undecided (or had been terminated).
Number in the GED preparation class - 17.
Every student has been called into the WIN office at least once in the last six months.
Each of the remaining students has been tested at least once in the last six months.

SOME INFERENCES DRAWN

Over one-half of the students have been at Doolittle for one year or less.
Twenty of the seventy-seven have over two years at Doolittle.
Mean age is thirty-two years.
Only seven students (WIN) use the day care center.
The majority of those attending have some high school training.
At least twenty students have had some training prior to entering Doolittle and since having dropped out of regular school.
The majority of the students had only a fair to poor attendance record.
WIN referred only six students to Doolittle, thus perhaps accounting for the fact that so few had any definite employability plans, or definite vocational goals.
The major portion of the students have been in the WIN program less than one year.
One striking feature remains and warrants comment: no matter how long the student attends Doolittle the average grade point improvement rarely exceeds 1.5.

CONCLUSIONS

Many enrollees still do not have definite plans or vocational goals.
Some WIN teams have only recently started to develop employability plans for their enrollees.

APPENDIX TABLE I

CHANGES IN AMOUNT OF COMMUNICATION AMONG CONFEREES IN THE DOOLITTLE PROJECT
(Reported by Group Mean)

	Knowledge of Conferee		Discussion about Doolittle with Conferee	
	PRE	POST	PRE	POST
	Checked that he/she knew this person "a lot"	"I have chatted with or phoned this person since the December Conference"	"I have discussed a situation at Doolittle with this person."	"I have discussed a problem of issue regarding the Doolittle Project"
Students				
7	12.5	21.1	20.	18.4
15	15.	15.8	15.	10.5
18	7.5	28.9	15.	18.4
20	15.	42.1	20.	34.2
25	20.	26.3	17.5	15.8
29	12.5	28.9	20.	13.2
33	17.5	18.4	17.5	13.2
36	12.5	26.3	15.	13.2
Teachers				
6	20.0	28.9	25.	18.4
8	22.5	26.3	20.	13.2
11	2.5	34.2	12.5	26.3
12	20.	31.6	17.5	13.2
16	12.5	23.7	12.5	15.8
17	10.	26.3	20.	13.2
19	20.	23.7	25.	15.8
30	12.5	34.2	35.	26.3
31	17.5	21.1	20.	7.9
Public Aid				
3	20.0	36.8	32.5	26.3
4	20.	34.2	17.5	21.1
5	17.5	26.3	15.	21.1
10	7.5	26.3	15.	21.1
21	10.0	26.3	20.	15.8
23	15.	21.1	17.5	18.4
24	17.5	28.9	25.	21.1
27	17.5	23.7	22.5	21.1
28	15.	18.4	20.	13.2
WIN				
1	10.	26.3	17.5	18.4
2	7.5	23.7	12.5	13.2
9	7.5	18.4	12.5	10.5
13	7.5	21.1	12.5	10.5
14	15.	26.3	20.	10.5
22	7.5	21.1	12.5	10.5
26	2.5	21.1	5.	5.3
32	12.5	18.4	15.	10.5
34	15.	23.7	22.5	10.5
35	12.5	21.1	20.	7.9

APPENDIX TABLE J

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS GIVING NO ANSWER TO QUESTIONS RELATING TO COMMUNICATIONS WITH PROFESSIONALS IN THE THREE AGENCIES IN SEVEN CATEGORIES

Category	PRE-TEST		POST-TEST	
	Doolittle	Midwest	Doolittle	Midwest
1. Teacher like to take class from				
1st choice	14	13	0	17
2nd choice	35	30	3	17
3rd choice	51	57	27	25
Average	33	33	10	20
2. Teacher like to take shop from				
1st choice	37	17	3	33
2nd choice	46	56	33	33
3rd choice	79	85	60	50
Average	54	53	32	39
3. Person like talk about personal problem with				
1st choice	20	20	0	8
2nd choice	62	52	23	33
3rd choice	83	74	43	42
Average	55	49	22	28
4. Person like to give idea to improve school to				
1st choice	35	24	30	8
2nd choice	71	54	43	25
3rd choice	86	83	60	42
Average	64	54	44	25
5. Person like to talk about money problem with				
1st choice	19	24	7	8
2nd choice	68	80	37	25
3rd choice	92	90	57	50
Average	59	65	34	28
6. Person would complain to				
1st choice	9	11	3	17
2nd choice	48	65	40	42
3rd choice	68	78	50	50
Average	42	51	31	36
7. Person like to share future hopes and plans with				
1st choice	14	13	13	8
2nd choice	51	33	33	33
3rd choice	72	50	50	42
Average	45	32	32	28
Average number of No Answers for seven questions	50	48	29	29

APPENDIX TABLE K

KNOWLEDGE OF THE SYSTEM[1]

Percentage of Right Answers
(On this and all following tables, D = Doolittle & M = Midwest)

		PRE-TEST				POST-TEST			
		Students	Teachers	Public Aid	WIN	Students	Teachers	Public Aid	WIN
1. All students receive PA in this center (A = Yes)	D	59	63	60	54	63	77	100	24
	M	71	77	100		58	83	100	
2. Students must attend nearest center (A = No)	D	45	44	70	60		53	43	69
	M	30	53	100			58	100	
3. If on PA, must attend school or lose eligibility (A = No)	D	45	44	80	71		46	100	69
	M	46	47	100			42	100	
4. If not on PA you cannot attend adult education centers (A = No)	D	46	25	50	63		53	43	48
	M	41	53	60			50	100	
5. Any adult enrolled at adult education center is eligible for WIN (A = No)	D	63	25	70	75	70	46	71	76
	M	41	24	40		58	58	100	
6. If enrolled in WIN a student can be asked to leave school (A = Yes)	D	39	19	70	52	33	23	71	24
	M	44	29	40		33	33	67	
7. A student who earns a GED may enroll in any college (A = No)	D	11	31	60	58	33	46	57	55
	M	22	47	60		33	42	0	
8. PA personnel can obtain money to support qualified students in college (A = Yes)	D	52	31	70	33	27	77	43	48
	M	74	47	100		75	58	0	
9. PA keeps standardized list of allowances (A = Yes)	D	60	31	100	73	87	77	100	69
	M	87	59	100		92	83	100	
10. A WIN enrollee who does not attend school regularly may be dropped from WIN (A = Yes)	D	54	31	50	31	73	54	43	41
	M	76	29	100		83	25	33	
11. What is passing score on GED (A = 225)	D	25	31	0	35	30	54	43	69
	M	22	35	40		33	25	100	
12. What are sections of the GED test (5 or 6)	D	0	25	10	21	23	62	29	48
	M	0	18	20		8	58	67	

---

[1] All data reported here are based on the N's reported in Table 1. In this report, "no answer" is not accounted for. Since percentages in the case of Midwest Public Aid are based on an N of 5 for pre-test and 3 for post-test, great care should be taken in interpreting these data.

APPENDIX TABLE L

PROFESSIONALS' OPINION OF IMPORTANT PROBLEMS TO BE TREATED IN IN-SERVICE TRAINING

(Reported by average percentage[1])

	Teachers			P. A.			W I N		
	Student Orientation[2]	Academic Structure, Policy[3]	Mechanics[4]	Student Orientation	Academic Structure, Policy	Mechanics	Student Orientation	Academic Structure, Policy	Mechanics
Doolittle	15	10	13	28	0	9	13	15	14
Midwest	26	20	14	44	11	0			

[1] The respondents' first three listings of problems were coded. The percentages of responses falling into each of the three categories above were added in each category and divided by three to gain an average percentage for each.

[2] Student orientation = responses showing a concern for understanding students' background and experience, and relevance of program to students' needs.

[3] Academic, Structure, Policy = responses relating to curriculum, teaching method, or the coordination of all three agencies at either the top level or locally.

[4] Mechanics = responses relating to rules and procedures, or physical facilities.

ERIC Clearinghouse
OCT 18 1971
on Adult Education

ERIC Cl
OCT 18
on Education